

# Anglican Theological Review

EDITED BY

FREDERICK C. GRANT AND BURTON S. EASTON

Founded by SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

---

NUMBER XX

APRIL, 1938

NUMBER 2

---

## THE GENESIS OF THE RELIGIOUS FORMULA OF THE TRINITY

By CHARLES W. LOWRY

Virginia Theological Seminary, Alexandria, Virginia

Underlying the whole vast subject of the development of the doctrine of the Trinity in Christian theology is a specific problem that is commonly overlooked. This problem has reference to the *Entstehung* or origin of the doctrine. It is ultimately twofold in character, as has been clearly perceived by Dr K. E. Kirk.<sup>1</sup> In its first phase the problem is that of the development which lies behind and is crystallized in the religious formula of the Trinity. The second phase has regard to the theological formula and the development it represents and registers. Broadly speaking, the two phases correspond respectively to the evolution of the Trinity of experience and to the effort to pass from this phenomenally presented conception to its noumenal or ontological ground, although such a mode of description is anachronistic. The data in the first case are mainly furnished by the New Testament.<sup>2</sup> The final

<sup>1</sup> *Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation* (ed. Rawlinson), p. 159.

<sup>2</sup> Not that the formulae to be found in the Apostolic Fathers, the so-called short Roman symbol, and the Rule of Faith as preserved by Irenaeus and Tertullian are to be overlooked. But without exception these are, from the Trinitarian point of view, less satisfactory and, paradoxically enough, seem more primitive than the Matthean formula of the triune Name.

result of the New Testament development on its religious side, the Baptismal Formula of Matt. xxviii. 19, represents the characteristic religious formula of the Trinity.<sup>3</sup> It is with the origin of this formula that we are here concerned. The theological formula<sup>4</sup> presents a distinct and more familiar problem.

All historical investigation is concerned with two things. The historian wishes to find out what happened, as it happened: the process of events in their correct sequence. He must also inquire, why did it happen? It is necessary to seek to penetrate behind the events to the causes at work. In other words, history is fact plus interpretation.

As regards the process of events, Harnack is by general consent the historian of dogma *par excellence*. In nothing is this better illustrated than in his short monograph, *An Inquiry into the Origin of the Trinitarian Formula*.<sup>5</sup> It requires to be corrected in one or two places; but these corrections can be simply made, and the necessity for them can easily be shown to arise from the desire to interpret the facts in a certain way having been allowed to get out of hand. As a whole it gives the facts in an unsurpassed manner.

The presupposition of Harnack's essay is the 'fundamental methodological principle that we must not wander far afield

\* It seems better to take this as representing the religious formula rather than the official Nicene statement—cf. Kirk, p. 159. The reason for this is not that the former is uninfluenced by theology, whereas the Nicene formula is quasi-theological. As a matter of fact religious experience is always affected, mediated, directed, and thus in part created, by theological ideas. This applies to the Matthean formula quite as much as to the Nicene symbol. But in the New Testament the theology is much more entirely in solution. The influence of ideas reached by reflection is relatively much more unconscious. We are closer than we ever are again to 'pure' experience, to that creative experience of Jesus Christ as an historical personality which must be held to be the prime factor in the genesis of Christianity. The Nicene religious formula, on the other hand, presupposes a considerable period of 'precipitated' theology, with dogmatic theology progressively tending to become a conscious regulative factor in Christian experience. Nicea preceded the Synod of Constantinople by only fifty-seven years.

<sup>3</sup> Viz. one *ousia* (*substantia*) in three *hypostases* (*prosopa*, *personae*).

<sup>5</sup> In *Constitution and Law of the Church* as Appendix II.

until inquiry close at hand has turned out to be without result.' <sup>6</sup> He begins by noting the age of the Trinitarian formula in Christianity and the fact that St Matthew belongs to Palestine. <sup>7</sup> These two facts suggest the serious error of the method which tries to evolve the formula from the influence of a heathen religion or a Jewish syncretistic sect; <sup>8</sup> and Harnack thinks that the results of his inquiry vindicate his having left severely alone 'all considerations of Babylonian, Greek or Kamtschatkan triads.' <sup>9</sup> He concludes that the fundamental confession of 'Father, Son and Holy Spirit' arose as 'the supreme expression of the new religion on the soil of Judaism' <sup>10</sup> and that it was originally evoked as 'an anti-Jewish product of the Christian religion.' <sup>11</sup>

The evolution of the religious formula embraces, according to Harnack, two main stages: the development of a bipartite formula and the transition from it to a tripartite formula. A third stage, closely related to the first, concerns the transition from the phraseology 'God, Jesus Christ, and Holy Spirit' to 'Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.' Finally, the inclusion of 'the name' in the Matthean Baptismal formula is noted. It will be convenient to consider in turn each of these steps.

#### (a) THE BIPARTITE FORMULA

Harnack lays great stress on the priority of this formula. John xvii. 3 is cited as the normative summary of the first phase of its development and as containing in embryo the primitive form of the Apostolic Symbol. <sup>12</sup> So far we are treading on firm ground. <sup>13</sup> It is not abandoned when Harnack

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 273.

<sup>7</sup> Pp. 259-60; cf. p. 269.

<sup>8</sup> P. 260.

<sup>9</sup> P. 273.

<sup>10</sup> P. 272.

<sup>11</sup> P. 273.

<sup>12</sup> P. 262.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. John xvii. 18, 21, 25, iii. 34, vi. 29, 44, 57, viii. 42, x. 36; Matt. x. 40 (Luke x. 16); and Mal. iii. 1. Also Acts ii. 22, I Tim. ii. 5, Rom. v. 15, Acts iii. 13, iv. 27, 30; and finally Acts iii. 22, Luke vii. 16, xiii. 33, xxiv. 19.

goes on to conclude, from John i. 17, that in this connection Christ and what he brought (grace and truth) were opposed to Moses and the law.<sup>14</sup> When however he tacitly equates ἡ Χάρις διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ and ἡ Χάρις τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ and advances the suggestion that 'the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God' is, like John xvii. 3, a very old formula which arose out of controversy with the Jews,<sup>15</sup> I venture to think that a false step has been taken. It is, to be sure, true that for St Paul the 'one true God (μόνος ἀληθινὸς θεός) must never be put on one side; He must be mentioned along with the Χάρις and He must also receive a predicate, and indeed one which is still more comprehensive.' Further Harnack is not wrong, in all probability, in connecting the predicate chosen by St Paul with I John iv. 8 and John iii. 16,<sup>16</sup> although which is ultimately antecedent and which consequent or whether there is an ultimate common antecedent of both in a lost primitive formula, as Harnack suggests, are questions which in the nature of the case cannot be determined. These coincidences lend plausibility to the interpretation of the first two phrases of II Cor. xiii. 13 as a parallel and very old bipartite formula.<sup>17</sup> An elementary consideration of St Paul's Christology shows, however, the inadequacy of such an hypothesis and reveals the presence of a factor which Harnack has overlooked. The point can be put quite simply. St Paul, in his thought of Christ and more especially in his devotion to him as Lord (κύριος), has left categories like 'messenger' and 'prophet' behind. This Christ, ὁ κύριος was and is an heavenly being, enjoying an intimate and special relation to God but distinguished from Him as a divine Agent. This Christ, of his own free will and out of his loving favour or Χάρις, gave up his heavenly estate and his celestial mode

<sup>14</sup> P. 263. Cf. Acts iii. 22; also John v. 45, 46, vi. 32.

<sup>15</sup> P. 264.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>17</sup> As does such a verse as Rom. i. 5, which affords a striking parallel to John i. 17, both in the sense in which Χάρις seems to be used and in the use of the preposition διὰ. Cf. Rom. v. 2; and also I Cor. i. 4, in which however it is the Χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ and is given ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.



of existence; assumed our body of flesh, lived on the earth as a man, and for our salvation suffered death upon the cross; after which God raised him from the dead and exalted him above all the rest of creation, giving him the name which is above every name, viz. *κύριος*.<sup>18</sup> Phi. ii. 5 sq. and II Cor. viii. 9 taken in conjunction with Gal. ii. 20 show conclusively that St Paul is conscious of the loving and saving favour of Christ as a personal agent and that his gratitude for this *graciousness* knows no bounds.<sup>19</sup> It is this development of *Χάρις* and its association with Jesus Christ as Lord that Harnack has failed to take into account. The reason is not far to seek. He is, like Peter on the mount of transfiguration, so eager to build a tabernacle about the messenger idea of Jesus and to dwell there forever, that his vision of the facts of history is temporarily obscured. 'The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God' represents, not a formula parallel to John xvii. 3, but one which takes a new step.<sup>20</sup> Jesus Christ has become 'Lord' and is a religious object; the *Χάρις* is thought of as a personal predicate pertaining to him and no longer as merely *διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*.

#### (b) THE TRIPARTITE FORMULA

The earliest one known to us is II Cor. xiii. 13, in which the Holy Spirit is co-ordinated with Jesus Christ and God

<sup>18</sup> This I take to be the point of the juxtaposition of Phil. ii. 11 and ii. 9-10.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Gal. i. 3-5, which brings out also the rôle and primacy of God the Father.

<sup>20</sup> One may conjecture that, actually, the bipartite formula in question is enshrined in the formula of salutation: Grace be to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ (Rom. i. 7, I Cor. i. 3, II Cor. i. 2, Phil. i. 2, Eph. i. 2, Philem. 3; and with minor variations: II Thess. i. 2, Gal. i. 3, I Tim. i. 2, II Tim. i. 2, Tit. i. 4); and that II Cor. xiii. 13 is the result of an inspired moment in which the Apostle achieves simultaneously a slight amplification of this bipartite formula and the step to a tripartite formula. The main point, in any event, is not affected. I suggest this, however, as a partial explanation of the seemingly stubborn binitarianism of St Paul, to which Dr Kirk in particular directs attention and which seems inconsistent with the Apostle's doctrine of the Holy Spirit taken as a whole. John xvii. 3 illustrates, or at least may with a high degree of likelihood be taken to illustrate, the way in which an older idea which has become stereotyped in a formula lingers on long after it has ceased to express the full view of the writer or of the community he is addressing.

in connection with ἡ κοινωνία. It may be said dogmatically that the third member of the Trinity was bound to be the Holy Spirit. If there were yet earlier threefold formulae standing behind II Cor. xiii. 13, which have not come down to us, there can be no real question that the third term was the Spirit. Harnack, it is true, is fascinated by the position of 'Holy Church' in the Apostolic symbol and by the history of this article of belief; and he is unable to resist the seduction of toying with the idea of a more primitive and, as it were, tentative tripartite formula which ran, 'God, Christ, and the Church.'<sup>21</sup> But the subsequent serious and most valuable discussion of the Spirit in the primitive Christian community shows that as a matter of sober history he does not take such a position. This is made quite clear in Harnack's last relevant work, *Die Entstehung der Christlichen Theologie und des Kirchlichen Dogmas* (1927—untranslated).<sup>22</sup> The Spirit is placed at the head of the sources and authorities for the proclamation, the theology, and the dogma.<sup>23</sup> The fourth article of the proclamation to be enumerated and discussed, viz. the Holy Spirit, the Holy Church, and the Resurrection, is characterized as from the standpoint of thought the most original, since it was won wholly out of the experience of the community and of the individual. The relation of the three elements constituting the article in question is clearly stated: "it is the proclamation of the Spirit of Christ working on now and of its work, which is given, at the present, in the foundation and guidance of a community of the elect and holy—the church; but in the future, in the raising of the believers from the dead, which is consummated in the resurrection of the flesh."<sup>24</sup> This leaves us in no doubt as to which is

<sup>21</sup> Op. cit. p. 265.

<sup>22</sup> The fragment 'Der Gegenwärtige Christus' (1928) in the volume *Aus der Werkstatt des Vollendeten* (Giessen, 1930) does not add anything of importance: it rather brings together within a very small compass and re-enforces ideas that are set forth in the *Entstehung*.

<sup>23</sup> P. 21.

<sup>24</sup> P. 49.

regarded as prior, causal, and central: the Spirit or the Church. And it is surely in accord with the evidence of *Acts* and of the New Testament as a whole.<sup>25</sup> The former might with precise accuracy be entitled either "the Acts of the Spirit" or "the Acts of the Apostles in the Spirit"; while the New Testament is, in the words of Hoyle,<sup>26</sup> 'pre-eminently the book of the Holy Spirit,' who is referred to in every one of its writings except II and III John. Not that the church was unimportant, even relatively so. Harnack is right in persistently drawing attention to the close connection between 'Holy Spirit' and 'Holy Church.' Neither the common adjective 'holy' nor their proximity in the *Apostolicum* can be considered accidental. But to suppose that the order of the two phrases is accidental or reversible and that 'the Church' might have been added to 'God and Jesus Christ' as the third in a tripartite formula, is an error of the first magnitude.<sup>27</sup> It is to confuse cause and effect. It is to ignore the fundamental distinction between the continuing action of God,

<sup>25</sup> As well as that of *Hermas*, on which Harnack lays great stress: pp. 21-22.

<sup>26</sup> E.R.E., art. "Spirit."

<sup>27</sup> I have given reasons for believing that Harnack does not go beyond playing with such a supposition. It should be noted, however, that according to his settled view 'the Spirit' and 'the Church' were *unter einem gewissen Gesichtswinkel* from the beginning identical for believers. The *identitäts-satz* 'the holy Spirit, a holy Church' of the oldest symbol is a precipitation of this 'paradoxical conception' (p. 29. Cf. the phrase, which I am not able to identify, *ecclesia ipsa est spiritus* quoted in *Der Gegenwärtige Christus*). Similarly 'the resurrection of the flesh.' The idea is illustrated by the diagram

God	The Father	The Almighty
Jesus Christ	The Son of God	Our Lord
Holy Spirit	Holy Church	Flesh-resurrection

"Diese Worte können und sollen sozusagen horizontal und vertikal gelesen werden, und sie stellen Identitäts-Gleichungen dar oder konnten (sollten?) doch so verstanden werden. Das ist für die Entstehung und Entwicklung der Trinitätslehre von hoher Bedeutung gewesen. Im Gegensatz zum Judentum ist die Christliche Verkündigung—soweit, wie wir sie zurückfolgen können—in der Heidenkirche Verkündigung von Gott, dem Herrn Jesus und dem heiligen Geist, und zwar als 'der Glaube und die Hoffnung der Erwählten' (I Clem. c. 58) gewesen" (p. 52).

builded upon and continuous with the life and work of Christ, and the result of that action. It is here that we discern the real reason for the inclusion of the Spirit in a tripartite formula and the propriety and inevitableness of that step. The Spirit represents a type of action or agency from the divine side of things which is in the closest relation to but is not the same as the love of God or the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is the third great datum of the Christian faith and the second distinguishing mark of the infant church, in comparison with her parent, Judaism. From the latter point of view, as well as from that of the intrinsic character of the experience, the Spirit was scarcely less important than Christ and was most naturally set beside the latter and the one God of the *Shemà* in a summary of the new religion. For the Spirit was thought to have been poured out on all believers and to be the normal possession of the church.<sup>28</sup> And behind this lay Pentecost and the belief that it marked the fulfillment of Joel ii. 28sq. and the inauguration of the Messianic age.<sup>29</sup> The relation of Jesus, whom *καὶ κύριον καὶ Χριστὸν ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός*,<sup>30</sup> to this event and the association of both with God are set forth in Acts ii. 32, 33, which, if not the earliest Trinitarian passage in the New Testament, represents the earliest Trinitarian thought in a Christian sense and discloses the ultimate source of the religious formula of the Trinity.<sup>31</sup>

It remains to ask whether the third term of the Pauline formula (II Cor. xiii. 13) is the expression of a development at all parallel to what we have seen to be behind St Paul's bipartite formula. Was the Spirit, like Christ, thought of as an agent distinct from God, although in the closest harmony with Him, and as a third co-ordinate religious object? A certain answer cannot be given. The conception and expe-

<sup>28</sup> Cf. John vii. 39.

<sup>29</sup> Acts ii. 14 sq.

<sup>30</sup> Acts ii. 36.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Harnack's characterization of I Cor. xii. 3 as the key to the problem of the transition from a bipartite to a tripartite formula. (*Constitution* etc., p. 267n).

rience of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament is infected with a radical ambiguity. On the one hand, it is a gift, an influence, a *virtus*. It is the name of the immanent divine activity. On the other hand, it is personified if not personalized, i.e. is literally a spirit: the Holy Spirit. It is the name of the divine agent which acts in man and in the Christian community; and this name is not just a synonym for God or Christ. The element common to both conceptions is that the Spirit is sent. God, or God with and through Christ, is the sender. This situation finds its most signal expression in the epistles of St Paul; and the confusion is increased by the apparent identification of Christ and the Spirit in II Cor. iii. 17-18.<sup>32</sup> It is, further, doubtful whether any trustworthy

<sup>32</sup> Le Breton interprets this verse by a sifting and elimination of alternatives. That Christ is Spirit (presumably he has in mind here I Cor. xv. 45 and John iv. 24) is impossible because of the article. That He is the Holy Spirit is impossible because of the clear personal distinction elsewhere made (in another place he considers apparent 'equivalences' of the two and concludes: to infer from them 'l'identité personnelle du Christ et de l'Esprit-Saint serait tout à fait injustifiée, d'autant qu'en pressant la même méthode on pourrait identifier l'Esprit et le Père.' I, p. 328). Therefore "on peut traduire: 'Le Seigneur est l'esprit dont il a été parlé plus,' c'est-à-dire l'esprit oppose à la lettre; cette interprétation donne un sens exact" (*Histoire du Dogme la Trinité*, Tome I: *Les Origines*, Paris, 1910, pp. 493-4). The most obvious and gravest objection to this ingenious and logical interpretation, unless it be that St Paul could so very easily have said this had he meant it, is the reiteration of the same apparent identification in the next verse (rendering ἀπὸ κρυπτῶν Πνεύματος with the RV and Moffatt and with the American revisers and Plummer, *Second Corinthians*, p. 108, viewing the RV margin as a not very likely option). It is tempting to render, as presumably the authors of our Nicene Creed did, ὁ δὲ κύριος τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐστίν 'The Spirit is the Lord' and, bringing v. 18 into line with it by adopting the RV margin, to connect the passage with Karl Barth's salient thought on the Trinity: "Das also, diese dreifaltige Weise Gottes der Herr zu sein, ist die Grundlage des Gottesgedankens, wie ihn die Kirche auf Grund des Offenbarungszeugnisses der Propheten und Apostel denken musste und denken muss" (*Dogmatik*, p. 155). But Plummer (p. 104) says this 'Trinitarian' rendering of v. 17 (as well as v. 18) is very unlikely. We must, it would seem, remain in doubt as to St Paul's exact meaning, while, in the absence of further evidence to the contrary, we assume that the apparent identification in II Cor. iii. 17-18, as well as in passages such as Le Breton cites (see above), is to be understood 'not of substantial identity but of inhaltlicher gleichbestimmtheit und heilsgeschichtlichen zusammengehörigkeit' (O. Kirn, *Realencyklopädie*, Art. *Trinität*).



conclusion can be based on ἡ κοινωνία.<sup>33</sup> We are thus barred from concluding that the third term of the Pauline trinitarian formula epitomizes a development of idea, experience, and devotion substantially parallel to that reflected in 'the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ.' That is, we cannot affirm that the Spirit was for St Paul a third religious object in the clear-cut personal manner in which Christ was a second. But the fact remains that St Paul places the Holy Spirit with God and with Christ as a third, and that this is not an isolated verse.<sup>34</sup> Equally certain it is that not more than a year before the trinitarian benediction was penned, he had described the Spirit as the self-consciousness of God,<sup>35</sup> that which knows God's mind, even as it is the spirit of a man which knows his mind;<sup>36</sup> and that not more than two years after this,<sup>37</sup> he wrote that the Spirit with unutterable groanings makes intercession for the saints and may be described as possessing a mind (literally, an object of thought: τὸ φρόνημα τοῦ Πνεύματος).<sup>38</sup> These two converging lines of evidence warrant the conclusion that the Spirit in II Cor. xiii. 13 is not thought of as impersonal and that at the same time it is not equated with either of the two persons, God or Christ. In the Pauline religious formula of the Trinity, the divine outgoing represented by the κοινωνία of the Holy Spirit is put on a level with the ἀγάπη of God and the Χάρις of the Lord Jesus

<sup>33</sup> "No exegetical skill, as Lietzmann says, can give certainty as to the exact meaning of ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος." (Plummer, p. 384.) Phil. ii. 1 (εἰ τις κοινωνία Πνεύματος) and I Cor. i. 9 (εἰς κοινωνίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν) intensify rather than illumine the difficulty.

<sup>34</sup> I Cor. vi. 11, xii. 3-7; Gal. iv. 6; Rom. viii. 9-11, 16-17; Phil. iii. 3; Eph. ii. 18, iv. 4-6.

<sup>35</sup> So Hoyle, *op. cit.* cf. Kirn (*op. cit.*): 'the self-consciousness by virtue of which God knows Himself.' A more accurate phrase than either would perhaps be: an element or aspect of the self-consciousness of God.

<sup>36</sup> I Cor. ii. 10-11.

<sup>37</sup> Following the dating of McNeile, *Introduction to the Study of the New Testament*, p. 109.

<sup>38</sup> Rom. viii. 26-27. Cf. I Cor. xii. 11: τὸ ἓν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα . . . καθὼς βούλεται.



Christ as one of the three moments of the personal activity of God in relation to his people.<sup>39</sup>

(c) THE FINAL STAGE

The last step is from 'God, the Lord Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit'<sup>40</sup> to 'the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit.' Two questions are here involved: the substitution of 'Father and Son' for 'God and Christ' and the addition of the one 'name.' Let us note each separately.

(1) Harnack's account of the transition from 'Jesus the Christ' to 'the Son' is again simple but acute. The expression 'the Son of God,' he explains, was bound to replace 'the Messiah' as the solemn expression for Jesus, since the proof of his messiahship, to Jews who did not believe in the resurrection, lay in the future and it was necessary to say something

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Kirn, *op. cit.*: "In II Cor. xiii. 13 the salvation-life (Heilsleben) goes back upon a three-fold causality, in which however is seen the oneness of the salvation-will (Heilswillen), which has been realized in the sending of the Son and in the communication of the Spirit."

<sup>40</sup> Plummer's explanation of the order of II Cor. xiii. 13, that the Apostle started to write the usual simple form of benediction and then for some reason expanded it (*op. cit.*, p. 383), seems more satisfactory than Harnack's (pp. 263-4). I Cor. viii. 6, which indeed Harnack cites, and the order of the usual formula of greeting support Plummer's suggestion. But the question remains, why did St Paul adopt and habitually use the simple benediction? At first sight it would seem that Harnack's idea in a modified form might be invoked to answer it. For in John i. 17 grace *through* Jesus Christ stands alone. Later God was added as a second term, with the predicate 'love'; and here one would compare (with Harnack) I John iv. 8 and John iii. 16. But why then does 'the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ' habitually stand alone? This benediction, which closes every Pauline epistle except Col., Eph., and II Cor. (leaving aside I and II Tim. and Tit.), renders very unlikely Harnack's idea of a very old bipartite formula which ran 'the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God' and calls for a broader hypothesis. I venture to suggest that 'the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ' is a development of *Χάρις διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* but that for St. Paul at least it early came to connote the loving favour of the person Jesus who 'though he was rich . . . became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich' (II Cor. viii. 9). The explanation of its original use is to be sought along the same lines as that of primitive baptism in the name of Jesus only. It lingered on, even after the binitarian formula of greeting based independently and more directly on the John i. 17 idea, just as that did after II Cor. xiii. 13, on the principle set forth *supra* n. 20.

about the historical Jesus as his followers had experienced him which would make it certain that he was the future Messiah and so the Messiah in the supreme sense.<sup>41</sup> St John's Gospel, with the light it throws upon the Jewish-Christian controversy at the time of its composition and the Christological gamut it runs: i.e. from 'he whom God has sent' to the 'only-begotten Son of the Father'—is again the key.<sup>42</sup> This is sound if the other side of the story is not overlooked, viz. the internal content of knowledge and experience. The latter comes to expression and to crystallization in formularies as a result of necessary apologetic and polemical ends, but it lives an independent and uncontingent life of its own.<sup>43</sup> It is the ultimate causal factor. In relation to the point at issue, this internal content contains two strands: experience and reflection connected with faith in the risen Christ and recollection of what the historical Jesus had said and had been. For our purpose it is not necessary to try to separate the two things with any precision.<sup>44</sup> We need only to keep generally in mind the dual character of the process which took place.

<sup>41</sup> P. 271.

<sup>42</sup> P. 270.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. the relation of heresies to creedal statements from the middle of the second century through the council of Chalcedon. It was ends connected with the refutation and expulsion of the former which led to the sharpening of formularies expressing the faith. But it is to be noted that there was a faith, the life of which was felt to be in danger; and that it was this faith which leaders of the Church attempted to embody in the sharply defined *regula fidei*.

<sup>44</sup> If indeed it is ultimately possible. In any case the critical questions involved with the effort to do so lie outside the scope of the present inquiry. The order of the two strands as here given is probably chronologically correct. The first chapters of the *Acts* reveal a primary preoccupation with the resurrection, the Messiahship of Jesus, interpreted through the medium of Old Testament prophecy, salvation in his name, and the possession and power of the Holy Spirit (cf. St Paul's summary of the tradition as he received it, in I Cor. xv. 3-5). Reflection on these things would lead to recollection, and recollection in turn would stimulate anew reflection. The result would be a close interweaving and a reciprocal colouring of the two things, which is apparently what we find in the Christology of all four Gospels. Cf. *Riddle of the New Testament*, Hoskyns and Davey, pp. 160-1.

There was from the first a connection between the Messiah and sonship of a special kind. The conception of Messiahship enfolded the presupposition that the one sent as the organ of the realization of the theocracy stood near God and in a relation of special intimacy to Him.<sup>45</sup> 'The Son of God' was a Messianic title.<sup>46</sup> There can be no real doubt that this connection was present to our Lord's mind and that it played a chief part in his self-consciousness. Whether he derived it in the first instance from Jewish Apocalyptic literature, and which was prior in his consciousness, Messianic vocation or unique sonship, are questions which cannot be answered and which are perhaps of more interest than importance. This is the first datum. The second is to be sought in the first lull after the spiritual tempest of Pentecost and the ardour, simplicity, and tense expectation of its immediate sequel. Just when this lull came and what, beyond the rhythmic character of all experience, occasioned it, our records do not permit us to judge.<sup>47</sup> It probably varied with individuals. But it was then that the Apostles would naturally have begun to think and to ponder, from a wider point of view, on all that had happened. They would have dwelt on the connection between the Messiah and God's Son. They would have recalled what this connection had meant for the Lord when he was among them as a man and relevant things that he had said and experiences that they had shared with him. We may conjecture that St Mark reveals an early stage of

<sup>45</sup> This sentence is a revision of a statement made by Kirn (*op. cit.*). Cf. Enoch, cc. 46, 48, 49, 61, 62.

<sup>46</sup> Enoch 105, IV (2) Esdras vii. 27ff.

<sup>47</sup> The controversy over the law suggests a considerable change in atmosphere. St Peter's relapse in particular, if St Paul's account in Gal. ii. is to be accepted, might be cited as significant in this connection. But as is well known, St Luke's history is very far from consistent with St Paul's story; and the whole subject is shrouded in confusion. A second factor was doubtless the Lord's delay in returning. St Paul's epistles afford valuable data as to the evolution of an individual mind in regard to this problem. But it has to be remembered that he tended to work and to think on very independent lines (Gal. i. 11 sq., 18 sq.); and that, with one possible exception, his was by far the greatest mind among the Apostles.

the revival of emphasis upon the Son of God. The Messiah, however, remains central. Not long after this, with the fall of Jerusalem and still the tarrying of the Bridegroom, the orientation of thought towards the category of Sonship would have received an impetus. With the dispersal of the Jerusalem church and the consequent loosening of the bonds which had tended to keep at least one wing of the Church a movement within Judaism, increased by the characteristic and unvarying stubbornness of the Jew's loyalty in disaster, the motive emphasized by Harnack would have begun to operate. The advantages of stress upon the unique Sonship of Jesus and the need to ground his Messianism in this would quickly have become patent. It is at this point that St Matthew's Gospel must have been written. As is well known, it reflects a strong church consciousness and seems to be directly aimed at convincing the Jew. To this end Jesus is presented as the Messiah of prophecy but also as in his teaching explicitly the fulfiller of the law and as in his person the divine Son of God. In the last respect St Matthew's Gospel is particularly striking. His stress on and amplifying of the idea occupy a place well mid-way between St Mark and St John.<sup>48</sup> It is

<sup>48</sup> Seven of the eight instances in which Mark uses the title 'the Son of God' are taken over by Matthew. Mark iii. 11 is omitted. In addition the title is introduced into the Marcan material six times. 'My Father,' which does not occur in Mark (*cf.* Mark viii. 38: 'his Father') is introduced into the Marcan material six times; into the non-Markan seven times. The Marcan correlatives 'the Son . . . the Father' occur three times (repeated and twice in the famous passage from Matt. xi. 27). 'Your (thy) Father' which occurs once in Mark and is incorporated by St Matthew occurs also fourteen times in non-Markan material; 'our Father' once; 'their Father' once. Most important possibly of all is the fact that Mark's one instance (Mark v. 6—demoniac and excised in Matt.) of worshipping Jesus has become ten in Matthew (two in post-resurrection narrative and three—two describing intent only—in c. ii.). A comparison of Matt. and Luke shows that the latter has by no means kept pace with the first Gospel. He has the key Q-passages, with a slight variation (x. 22) and the title 'the Son of God' occurs eleven times (six from Mark). But 'my Father' occurs only four times, all but one in non-Markan material; 'your Father' four times; the simple 'Father' is much more common and is probably the Lucan reading in the Lord's prayer (xi. 2 RV); and Luke knows nothing of worshipping Jesus (possible exception of xxiv. 52. Also iv. 15 should not be overlooked; but the

the latter who makes the swing full circle. The Messianic idea is still present: the phrase 'the Son of Man' occurs eleven times; a colloquy between our Lord and the Jews regarding his claim to be the Messiah is reported;<sup>49</sup> Martha declares her belief that he is the Messiah, the Son of God;<sup>50</sup> and most important of all is the use made of the idea of 'the one sent of God.'<sup>51</sup> But the Messianic conception has been emptied of practically all eschatological content and the Messiah as such is of comparative unimportance in the Gospel as a whole. It is merely accessory to the thought of the divine Son of God, the only-begotten, existing with the Father before the world was; it is what 'the Son' seems long to have been in relation to 'Messiah' and 'Lord,' a pleonasm.<sup>52</sup> It is this development, carried to its supreme expression in St John, but by no means invented in broad outline by him, that is behind 'the Son' in St Matthew's summary of the Christian faith. When once this phrase took the place of 'Jesus Christ,'

*ὑπὸ πάντων* indicates that *δοξαζόμενος* means something very different from Matthew's *προσεκύνῃσαν*). Indeed he appears zealous to ascribe all praise and worship to God: e.g. the story of the shepherds in c. ii., v. 25-6, vii. 16, viii. 39—cf. Mark v. 6, 19-ix. 43, xviii. 43, and esp. xxiii. 47; also xxiv. 52, 53. Finally iii. 38 ('Adam the Son of God') and i. 32, 33 (coming between two of St Luke's independent uses of 'the Son of God') deserve attention, as does xii. 8, 9 in comparison with Matt. x. 32, 33. On the other hand, *ὁ κύριος* is a favourite title with St Luke, alone among the four Evangelists, occurring not less than fourteen times (*κύριος* without the article is about equally common in Luke and Matt.). This suggests a link with St Paul's *κύριος*-Christology.

<sup>49</sup> John x. 22 sq.

<sup>50</sup> xi. 27. Cf. iv. 25, 6; and there are at least seven similar if less striking instances.

<sup>51</sup> E.g. John xvii. 3: 'him whom thou didst send.' This phrase (with slight variants) occurs not less than seven times; and 'he that sent me' (with variants) not less than twenty-three times.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. Harnack, p. 265. An examination of St Paul's epistles reveals the interesting fact that, leaving aside Romans in which it occurs six times, the title 'Son' is used by him only eight times (three in Gal. and one each in I Th., I and II Co., Col., and Eph.). It occurs nine times in Hebrews, in which 'Lord' is very rare and 'Jesus,' 'Jesus Christ,' and 'Christ' all very common. 'Father' occurs only twice.—From all these data the fact emerges that in certain important and from the point of view of our immediate inquiry highly relevant respects, St Matthew stands nearer to St John than does any other New Testament writer.



the parallel introduction of 'the Father' for 'God' needs, as Harnack says,<sup>53</sup> no special explanation. Still it is worth noting that as we have seen, St Matthew repeatedly and pointedly makes use of the correlative titles 'Father' and 'Son' and that again the religious formula simply records a prior development and usage.

(2) What is behind the inclusion of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit under a singular name (*ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι*)? Harnack contents himself with noting that this mode of expression is not Greek.<sup>54</sup> The thought behind the expression is presumably the familiar Jewish conception of the divine Name. St Matthew would contrast the divine Name into which the Christian, on becoming such, is baptized, with the name of the object of Judaism's faith. And he specifies that it also is a singular name. This can hardly have been indeliberate. It is more likely that he had the *Shemā* in mind and wished, both on general principles and apologetically, to ward off any non-monotheistic interpretation of the object of Christian faith. It is unnecessary, in order to explain this, to attribute to St Matthew an immanent or ontological Trinity.<sup>55</sup> We have rather to do with a religious judgment. Christianity has not broken with the ethical and intellectual monotheism of the Old Testament. It does not threaten to revise the unitary nature of religious causation. In setting the Son of God, the Messiah, beside his Father, and in adding as a third the Spirit going forth continually from God in power and in inspiration, it does not assert three or even two gods. But it invokes a new Name: the name of One who is to be called

<sup>53</sup> P. 272.

<sup>54</sup> P. 269.

<sup>55</sup> The combination of the singular name, the omission of 'God,' and the co-ordination of Father, Son, and Spirit makes such a speculation tempting. The absence, however, of a definite doctrine of the real pre-existence of the Son, the fact that he is never called 'God,' and an examination of the comparatively few references to the (Holy) Spirit in St Matthew (eleven times in all—the first four of which are without the definite article) support Kirn's dictum that such an interpretation of Matt. xxviii. 19 is 'unzulässige dogmatische Ausdeutung' (*op. cit.*).



Father, who has, and has spoken and acted through, a Son, and who works continuously and normally by the power of His Spirit. Into this divine Name and into a fellowship the faith of which had this content, the Christian convert was to be baptized.

If this interpretation of Matt. xxviii. 19 be the correct one,<sup>56</sup> it is clear that the primary religious data on which the idea of the Trinity rests are not only given in a general way in the New Testament, so that some kind of a doctrine of the Trinity is, in Mackintosh's phrase, 'an irresistible deduction.'<sup>57</sup> They are also brought within the compass of a new confession of faith in God which, whether reached by a flash of intuition or in part by conscious ratiocination, is an extraordinarily adequate summary of the facts. These are: that God is one; that He who is creator of the world, and Father of Mankind, has also a divine Son, the Messiah; that it is this Son who as Jesus of Nazareth has appeared on earth, teaching and acting in the Father's name, and will appear again, to judge the living and the dead; who is to be wor-

<sup>56</sup> As against the developed Trinitarian interpretation, on the one hand, and, at the other extreme, the exegesis which sees τὸ ὄνομα as impliedly repeated before the Son and also the Spirit (*cf.* Moffatt's rendering 'the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit'—designed presumably to rule out this alternative). The latter view would involve the construction of St Matthew's formula as merely a simple enumeration of the triad of objects of faith: God the Father, the Son of God, the Spirit of God, in which case it could not be held that Matt. xxviii. 19 represents much, if any, advance on II Cor. xiii. 13 from the point of view of embodying all the main religious data and envisaging the central paradox of the Trinity. One would have to be content with saying that these formulæ set forth the Trinity (the triad, the three) as historically revealed and named, and to look to verses like Eph. ii. 18 and Rom. xi. 36 for the other side of the eventual paradox: Trinity in unity. The first, of which Le Breton says, the trinitarian doctrine of St Paul 'peut se résumer tout entière dans ce texte' (*op. cit.*, I, p. 342), asserts the unity of Christian experience and emphasizes the mediatorial and instrumental character of Christ and of the Spirit. Rom. xi. 36 affirms the absolute unity and identity of God amid a three-fold creative activity and relationship. This verse, says Barth, 'ist die genaueste und klarste Formel zum Verständnis der unitas und trinitas Dei . . . auch . . . zum Verständnis der Offenbarung' (*Dogmatik*, p. 151).

<sup>57</sup> *Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ*, p. 509.

shipped; and that the Holy Spirit through whose agency the Son was wonderfully born of Mary and through whom the Father normally works is in some sense to be distinguished from the Father. The way is thus cleared and the stage set for the task of Christian theology. This task is to work out a scientific and rational formula, a *dogma*, which, without transgressing the limits imposed by the singularity of the divine Name, exemplifies and makes credible the data of history and revelation as apprehended by Christian faith.

## STUDIES IN THE TEXT OF ST MARK

By FREDERICK C. GRANT, Seabury-Western Theological Seminary

### I

The importance of the textual criticism of the New Testament is more generally recognized today than it has been for two generations, in fact since the publication of Westcott and Hort's New Testament in 1881.

The long undisputed reign of the 'Neutral' Text has come to an end. Von Soden's great work, though it roused expectations which it could not satisfy, the textual studies of Lake, New, Blake, Sanders, Streeter, Kenyon, Turner, and others, and above all the discovery of new manuscripts and fragments, have combined to show that no one type of text may claim the unqualified allegiance of the present-day student or editor. No one manuscript, or the united testimony of two (e.g. Vaticanus and Sinaiticus), is right every time, though a careful count might show them in the right in a majority of readings. Nor is any manuscript, even the crudest or shabbiest, always wrong. It is in fact impossible to decide readings solely upon the testimony of the 'best' manuscripts. Like a person of good family and background, a reading may enjoy a prejudice in its favor; but in the last analysis each must stand on its own merits. The famous dictum of Lehrs, 'Du sollst keinen Kodex anbeten: Thou shall not worship any ancient manuscript,' is sound and relevant. In contrast to the texts of the classical authors,<sup>1</sup> which usually stem from one ancestor, the more popular writings of the New Testament are usually derived from several, and were at one time copied with less fidelity; as popular writings, they came down through the era which produced the Apocryphal Acts and Gospels—some of the variant readings can hardly be called 'variants,' but introduce

<sup>1</sup> As Von Dobschütz pointed out (ed. of Nestle's *Einführung*, p. 118).

wholly new material; so that in the end Jerome's observation was justified: tot [recensiones] sunt paene quot codices. Moreover, copies were 'corrected,' i.e. revised, from other copies, whose character and provenance can only be surmised.

The theory of a 'Neutral' Text, i.e. of a type of text which survived unscathed through this period of free handling, we now recognize to be as much a theological product of the Victorian era as it is a conclusion of textual criticism—perhaps even more so! For the theory seemed to safeguard the sacred text, in spite of the divagations of manuscripts and critics. Like the ark in Israel's wanderings, it was the center of continuity and the seat of authority. If the multiplicity of evidently good readings had shattered the prestige of the Textus Receptus, the 'Neutral' Text could take its place as the all but infallible representative of the apostolic autographs. In fact, upon the basis of the presuppositions of both Anglican and Lutheran theology in the middle of the nineteenth century and after, it was inevitable that some such theory should emerge as that of Westcott-Hort, Tischendorf, and B. Weiss. The sacred ark had once preserved—now it was itself to be preserved! Aleph and B, the Sinaitic and Vatican Mss respectively, from their age, their completeness, their size and the evident esteem in which they had been held, the sumptuousness of their original format testifying to the confidence of the 4th or 5th century Church in their type of text—all this spoke strongly and decisively in their favor. The uniform excellence of their style, as contrasted with the slipshod errors of more than one of the other 'great uncials,' seemed to indicate that they had been providentially preserved and that their text was guaranteed as the authentic utterance of the Holy Spirit. In other words, it was a necessity of even nineteenth century Biblicism that the 'true text' had somehow been preserved safe and sound, in the midst of a wild harvest of false readings which had been maturing through the centuries; and certainly Aleph and B, with their fine grammar, diction, and syntax, merited the confidence of scholars bred in the classical tradition. Of course few persons suspected, at that time, that Aleph and B were themselves the product of editors

likewise schooled in the classical tradition, in third and fourth century Egypt—perhaps at its capital and center of learning, Alexandria.

But the situation has altered, partly as the result of Von Soden's work, partly of that of other and independent researchers. Erwin Nestle, for example, does not hesitate to use the symbol **h** (Hesychius) for the agreements of Aleph and B and their group. Whether or not it was Hesychius (about whom we know little enough!) who first edited this text, or made the chief contributions to the process, as Bousset argued, we cannot say. Yet somehow or other, as most present-day textual students suspect, his name is properly identified with the 3rd-4th century Egyptian recension which lies at the basis of Aleph and B.

At the same time, it has been useful to take one main type of text, the so-called (but miscalled) 'Neutral' and study others in relation to it. For it has helped to make clear (1) the extreme divergence of other types and (2) the wide geographical distribution of certain of these types—chiefly the so-called (but miscalled!) 'Western.' As a touchstone wherewith to test later readings (especially the so-called 'Syrian,' not to mention the Byzantine and Mediaeval), the 'Neutral' text has been useful. But it is not always the best type of text, and is far from infallible. One result of further study of the manuscript tradition of Mark, e.g. (and of the Synoptics as a group), is a clearer recognition of the outstanding *merits* of Aleph and B. As contrasted with the mass of later Mss, they are priceless. As a first large tool for distinguishing the pre-'Syrian' readings from the 'Syrian' and post-'Syrian,' they are indispensable. Hence, in a general way, Westcott-Hort, Tischendorf, Weiss, and later advocates of the 'Neutral' are justified in their views—though not in their terminology! But, on the other hand, (1) Aleph-B are simply *not infallible*, and Salmon's satire was not inappropriate: 'Where B and Aleph agree, follow them; where they disagree, prefer B; where B is clearly wrong, adopt the reading which B *should* have followed!' (2) They often correct the style of the earlier text. Usually these corrections can be recognized, especially when other

channels of tradition have carried down the earlier readings; and even when the majority, or even practically all other Manuscripts, give the B-Aleph reading, it is still sometimes possible to recognize the correction.

We are, in fact, now faced with the necessity of going back to the point where older scholars such as Griesbach and Lachmann left off—before the heyday of the 'Neutral'—and of carrying on from there. The critics of the English Revised Version, and of the Westcott-Hort text, so closely allied to it (Dr Hort supplying the New Testament Company with advance sheets of his Greek text, from time to time), were sometimes right but often wrong: Burgon, for example, was often wrong; Salmon, Tregelles, Scrivener were sometimes right. There are readings in the Revised Version that most certainly belong in the margin, and some in the margin that belong in the text; and there are some readings of the old Authorized Version that certainly should be restored. But the objection to the criticism levelled against Westcott-Hort and the Revised Version, as a whole, is that it assumed that the *Textus Receptus* was infallible where Westcott-Hort assumed the 'Neutral' Text to be. But *neither* is infallible—though of the two we grant today that probably the 'Receptus' is the less so. What is required is not a choice between Aleph-B and the Receptus, or between Aleph-B and the Old Latin or Old Syriac or Caesarean; what is required is not a choice between Mss or groups of Mss at all, but between readings, all of which stand upon their own feet and either maintain themselves or not according as they commend themselves to the patient judgment of objective scholarship.

Now there is no essential difference between editing a New Testament book or group of writings and editing a classical text—save that one is more popular, closer to the community in which it was produced and preserved, and shows fewer marks of individual authorship (this applies chiefly to the Gospels and Acts: though it does not apply to the extent of excluding individual authorship, style, or diction, but only the private production of the material these books contain). Westcott-Hort's great principle, 'Knowledge of Manuscripts must precede final judgment



of readings' (Introduction, § 38), emphasizes one principle in textual criticism. But it is a question if there is not a good deal more to be done after the Mss are studied individually and evaluated. And it is another question if Westcott-Hort did not stop with this preliminary investigation and alter their principle to make it read: Knowledge of Mss must precede . . . and when a generally superior Ms is discovered, prefer that as a rule. That is, their investigation led to the hypothesis of the 'Neutral' text, after which 'Prefer the neutral text' got substituted for their original principle. Thus the problem of text is not to be settled simply by classifying Mss as good, bad, and indifferent—or good, not so good, not good at all—and then preferring the good at all costs.

For it is perfectly clear that some poor Mss contain occasional good readings that have survived; and none of the good is infallible—not even B or Aleph.

It is strange how little account has been taken in textual criticism of the author's style—style ought to be a sure criterion of authenticity, if expressions characteristic of the author, or proved as his in uncontested passages, are involved in the variants. E.g., if a passage is found in two or three alternative forms, and one of the variant readings is definitely and demonstrably in the style of the author, the other (or others) definitely and demonstrably not in his style, the answer to any question of the original reading ought to be obvious. And where a choice is required between variants that are only relatively characteristic, or not characteristic, of the author's style, the choice ought similarly to be relatively simple. An author must be permitted to speak—or rather to write!—in his own style, or as nearly in his own style as it is possible under the present condition of his text!

Not only is the notion of a 'Neutral' Text, which has presumably come down unaltered—or practically unaltered—from the autographs, a survival of the days when the doctrine of the literal inspiration and inerrancy of Scripture ruled in theology; but the whole 'literary' conception of the early Canon has been considerably changed by recent research. For a long time now, the

second century has been looked upon as the period of the special 'floruit' of the so-called Western text. Opinion has varied as to its character, and quite diverse views have been held as to its origin. Special efforts have been made to relate that origin to a particular place and occasion (the latest being Dr Hatch's suggestion of Antioch, sometime in the second century—see his recent Hale Sermon.<sup>2</sup> On the whole, however, Jülicher's description of it has I think come to be generally accepted, viz. that it was a gradual growth, and took place during the era of uncontrolled private copying in the second century. Instead of being confined to the West, much of the evidence for its early dissemination points to Egypt—as Dr Sanders and others have shown. Its affiliations with the Early Syriac have never been satisfactorily explained, though Dr Hatch's suggestion has much to commend it, and I do not doubt that it accounts for more than one factor in its history. But not only the 'Western' type of text; *all* the various families and groups of Mss, along with their hypothetical ancestors, and the varied types they represent, even including the so-called 'Neutral,' point to a time when the books of the New Testament circulated either separately or in collections as more or less common property within the Church, so that each individual owner was free to make his own copy, enlarge, revise, supplement, or correct it, either with reference to some other copy or out of his own recollection of what was read in the church services—in the case of the Gospels, chiefly from the Gospel of Matthew. The marvel is that the process of correction and revision or supplementation was so restrained, and went no farther than it did. This no doubt was due not to any sense of canonical authority, since the N. T. books were not as yet formed into a canon, on a par with the sacred Scriptures of the Old Testament, but from a wholesome respect for apostolic authority: every book of the New Testament was attributed to an apostle, or failing that, at least to an 'apostolic' man, an associate of apostles. Thus Mark and Luke; thus Hebrews, Ephesians, II Peter, the Johan-

<sup>2</sup> *The 'Western' Text of the Gospels*, by W. H. P. Hatch. Published 1937 by Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, Evanston, Illinois.

nine Epistles, the Apocalypse, the Epistle of James, the Pastorals, for examples. It was probably the notion of apostolicity which did most to safeguard the text during that wild, free time in the early and middle second century when a large proportion of the variant readings arose. That owners were still at liberty to revise and compile is clear from the newly-found 'Fragments of an Unknown Gospel' in the British Museum.<sup>3</sup> And this of course does not take into account such variants as arose out of mere error in transcription—a phenomenon that has accompanied the text throughout its history. One would expect the notion of 'apostolicity' to safeguard the text of the autographs; and it did so, to a very considerable extent. But even before the theory of apostolicity gained a firm footing—say about the time of Justin Martyr, in his particular area—there was wide opportunity for variation. And no doubt 'apostolicity,' like other ecclesiastical ideas, was itself a gradual growth (as Harnack has shown) and did not suddenly and simultaneously appear full-blown in every quarter of the Christian world.

In his new work upon *The Text of the Greek Bible* (Duckworth, 1937), Sir Frederic Kenyon restates his conclusion that the main types of text—of which there were five, prior to the Byzantine—emerged out of the period of confusion in the second century, largely as the result of recensions. These five early types are as follows: the Western (D, the Old Latin), Caesarean (Theta, etc.), Alexandrian (Aleph, B, the Coptic Version), Syriac (the Old Syriac), and the 'Other' (viz. a classification for readings that do not fall into any of the preceding groups).

If Kenyon's conclusion is correct, the situation is completely changed from that in 1881. Instead of tracing back the text to its original in the autographs, by a steady process of convergence following back to a common source the divergent lines of descent, we shall have to stop when we get to the second century;<sup>4</sup> and in place of some rule of preference for one type of text over another, or for their common agreements over their divergences, we shall

<sup>3</sup> Edited by H. I. Bell and T. C. Skeat, 1935.

<sup>4</sup> Compare Lachmann's proposal—but he stopped at the fourth century.

have to trust a great deal more than heretofore to what is called internal criticism. In fact, this is about the point at which we had arrived anyway: the style of a New Testament author, for example, counts for a great deal more in textual criticism at the present time than it did in the nineteenth century; and Matthew, Luke, and even John are pretty good early witnesses to the text of Mark, for example; and so on. But now, with Kenyon's conclusions before us, it is more obvious than ever where our chief problems lie. "In the first two centuries this original text disappeared under a mass of variants, created by errors, by conscious alterations, and by attempts to remedy the uncertainties thus created. Then, as further attempts to recover the lost truth were made, the families of text that we now know took shape. They were, however, nuclei rather than completed forms of text, and did not at once absorb all the atoms that the period of disorder had brought into existence . . ." (p. 242).

I say we have arrived at about this point anyway; for who today would think of applying Gerhard of Maastricht's 43 'canons of criticism' (A.D. 1711)? Griesbach cut them down to 15, at the end of the 18th century, though Bengel, in 1734, had already reduced them to one—or perhaps we should say, subsumed them under one: his famous *proclivi [scriptioni] praestat arduor*. Wordsworth and White, in editing the Vulgate New Testament, reduced them to two: *brevior lectio probabilior*, and *vera lectio ad finem victoriam reportat*—though both these rules are questionable, the first almost as inevitably as the second. It is now clear that the 'brevior lectio' canon led directly to Westcott and Hort's preference for B. We may venture to state the general situation at present, and the new rules now in force, somewhat as follows:

1. No one type of text is infallible, or to be preferred by virtue of its generally superior authority.
2. Each reading must be examined on its merits, and preference must be given those readings which are demonstrably in the style of the author under consideration.

3. Readings which explain other variants, but are not contrariwise themselves to be explained by the others, merit our preference; but this is a very subtle process, involving intangible elements, and liable to subjective judgment on the part of the critic.<sup>5</sup>

## II

We turn now to the text of Mark, and I propose to present a few examples where the new perspective in textual criticism is specially important and suggestive.

It is a widespread belief among students of the New Testament that the text of Mark is relatively pure. It was not a popular Gospel, like Matthew or John, and so was not often copied; as a result, it suffered less at the hands of scribes than did Matthew, e.g., or Luke.

But this is a wrong impression. There are not only passages in Mark where the text is clearly corrupt (e.g. 3: 21, Jesus 'beside himself'), and some where the original reading is lost beyond recovery (e.g. 9: 49-50, 'salted with fire'), but the whole text has been glossed repeatedly, and assimilated to Matthew and Luke, chiefly to Matthew. It is sometimes easy to detect these assimilations, as when (e.g. 1: 6, John's girdle) the correspondence with Matthew is a word for word agreement and where the phrase or word fits ill with its Marcan context, though it fits perfectly in the Matthean original—and these are *not* examples of Matthew's improvement of Mark's style, but the reverse! But it is not always so easy to detect these instances, or to define precisely the amount of influence exerted by the text of Matthew upon that of Mark, even when we are sure it has been exercised—though it falls a long way short of the dependence, in the opposite direction, which made our First Gospel a kind of new edition of our Second.

Compared with Mark, the text of Matthew is relatively uncorrupt; that of Luke, except for glosses and interpolations at two or three points and the revision at the end, made no doubt at the

<sup>5</sup> Readers of Professor Colwell's recent *Study of the Bible* (pp. 61f) will realize how close is our agreement on this point.



time the Gospel and Acts were separated, is moderately uncorrupt—though no one of the three Synoptics is in perfect condition, or even to be textually revised or edited without the exercise of patient and painstaking toil. Our general impression is that, of the three gospels, Matthew's present text is closest to the autograph, Luke's next, Mark's last; and this no doubt reflects their popularity. Matthew was probably from the first an 'ecclesiastical' Gospel, perhaps written for a Christian community, and certainly used by one; Luke and Mark were less popular, either as written by 'apostolic men' (rather than by apostles), or as they came to be attributed to 'apostolic men' (rather than to apostles) in consequence of their relatively less popular use.

Mark 1: 6 reads, in the E. R. V., which is extremely literal and hence most useful for our present purpose, 'And John was clothed with camel's hair, and (had) a leathern girdle about his loins, and did eat locusts and wild honey.' Matt. 3: 4 reads, 'Now John himself had his raiment of camel's hair, and a leathern girdle about his loins; and his food was locusts and wild honey.' There the leathern girdle is the object of the verb 'had,' along with 'raiment,' and is not left hanging in the air, as in Mark, where it appears between two participles, and is attached to neither. Or, if any one insists that a man may be 'clothed' in a leather girdle—like the man in the nursery rhyme, 'clad all in leather'—at least the statement is clearer and smoother in Matt. than in Mark. Luke omits it altogether—he has no description of the Baptist's personal appearance or manner of life.

Now Mark likes such details, as has often been pointed out. They contribute to the 'vividness' of his style. And it is true that Matthew revises Mark and rearranges his order and sometimes improves his style. But the situation is further complicated by the substitution of *δεσμων* for *τριχας* in D and one Ms of the Itala (*a*), after which D and the Itala omit the whole phrase, 'And a leathern girdle about his loins.' It may seem that the leather girdle is unnecessary, after the mention of the camel's skin; and yet there are Old Latin Mss which retain *τριχας*



(=pilis), but omit the longer phrase that follows, 'And a leathern girdle about his loins.' So that I cannot believe Mark wrote this phrase: it has come over from the Gospel of Matthew, where it properly belongs, and where it is derived, almost word for word, from the LXX. (Mark I believe was not sufficiently familiar with the LXX to make such a borrowing.) In II Kings (4 Kgms.) 1:8 we read, *ανηρ δασυς* ('shaggy') *και ζωνην δερματινην περιεξωσμενος την οσφυν αυτου*. Hence I believe that Matthew retouched Mark by adding a phrase from the O. T. description of the original Elijah, now applied to the Elijah who had come again; and that in turn this phrase crept over into Mark's parallel passage, in all save D and the OL. It is tempting to go further, as I find Father Vaganay does,<sup>6</sup> and read *δερριν* in Mark; but I cannot go that length, at least not at present.

1:14 sounds very Pauline, as we read it in the R. V., 'preaching the gospel of God, and saying' . . . What is the 'gospel of God'? Is it the Gospel *from* God? Or *about* God? In either case, it is a theological idea, too theological for Mark; and in the former case it must be Pauline—though we know now (since Martin Werner's book on the subject<sup>7</sup>) that the 'Paulinism' of Mark is a nineteenth century myth.

Here is a case where I believe author's style is decisive, and that we should read, with the A. V., with the Receptus and the Byzantine Mss, with D and the Latins and many others, 'the Gospel of the Kingdom of God.' It is only here and in 1:1 (after it came to be used as a title!) that *ευαγγελιον* appears in Mark otherwise than absolutely (1:1, 14, 15, 8:35, 10:29, 13:10, 14:9 [16:15]—8 instances, including one in the Longer Ending). Matt. *regularly* uses 'Gospel of the Kingdom' (3 times, plus 26:13, 'this Gospel'), though *not* in the parallel to the present passage. Luke does not use *ευαγγελιον* at all in his Gospel, and only twice in Acts. Now although *ευαγγ. θεου* is a

<sup>6</sup> *Initiation à la critique textuelle néotestamentaire*, by L. Vaganay, Blond & Gay, 1934, pp. 166 ff.

<sup>7</sup> *Der Einfluss paulinischer Theologie im Markusevangelium*, Giessen, 1923.

Pauline phrase (Rom. 1:1, 15:16), it does not seem that Mark was familiar with Paul's writings. I believe therefore that Mark wrote 'Gospel of the Kingdom of God.'—And it certainly makes better sense in vv. 14–15.

2: 26 'When Abiathar was high priest' is omitted by D W it sy<sup>s</sup>. Now it may have been omitted by both parallels and by later scribes because the reference was an erroneous one; and if Mark was not very familiar with the O. T., as we believe he was not, such an error was perhaps not impossible; but I believe it was originally a gloss, and hence that D W it sy<sup>s</sup> preserve the original reading, from which it was absent. Had it crept into vs. 25, say, where we should have read, 'What David did in the days of Abiathar the high priest, when he had need . . . '—had the gloss been attached at *this* point, it would, I grant, have been much harder to detach and expunge. As it stands in vs. 26, it is pointless as well as mistaken: for the temple was not in Jerusalem but Nob; and the priest was not a high priest, but only a priest (I Sam. 21: 1–6); and his name was not Abiathar but Ahimelech—though the LXX may have taken the first step toward the error, in calling him Abimelech.

3: 21 'And when his friends heard it, they went out to lay hold on him: for they said, He is beside himself.' In spite of Field's learned note (in *Otium Norvicense* iii = Notes on the Tr. of the N. T.), to prove that *οι παρ' αυτου* means 'his friends' or 'kinsmen,' that exegesis is too clearly motivated by the attempt to relate vs. 21 to vv. 31ff (his mother and brethren calling to him from without, and Jesus' true relatives). But this is preposterous modernism, and overly 'psychological': it would never have occurred to Mark, who was no psychologist (cf. 3: 5)! In the first place, the *ελεγον γαρ* of vs. 21 is an impersonal plural (as so often in Mark) and, as Torrey rightly insists on many passages, no doubt goes back to the underlying Aramaic; moreover, in any case it need not necessarily refer to *οι παρ' αυτου*. At first glance, then, *οι παρ' αυτου*—if it means his family—went to seize him 'be-

cause *it was said* he is beside himself.' Their mission in vs. 31 then is one of mercy and tenderness, not motivated by a judgment upon his sanity but by a concern for his safety and protection.

In the next place, the fact that Jesus was surrounded by a crowd and was so busy he had not time to eat (or that the crowd was so large sufficient food was unobtainable; cf. 6: 36)—this is no sufficient explanation of the conclusion that he was 'beside himself.' Far from it! Such a conclusion was possible only in the minds of his opponents.

Now these appear in the variant of D W it—by all odds the 'harder' reading, for a Greek copyist: 'When the scribes and the rest heard about him—*περι αὐτοῦ*—they went out to seize him, for they said that he amazed (or mystified) them' (i.e. the crowd, by means of his miracles, his strange teaching, and his personal magnetism, which they no doubt conceived quite literally). *οἱ λοιποὶ* would certainly be a puzzle to a Greek scribe, though 3: 6 suggests who they were.

Vs. 21 refers then to the Galilean scribes (and 'Herodians' ?); vs. 22 to those scribes who came down from Jerusalem and passed an even harsher judgment upon him, viz. 'He hath Beelzebul.' This may reflect the historical situation; Jesus' worst enemies were the Jerusalem authorities, not the local Galilean, and it was in Jerusalem, not in Galilee, that he was put to death.

The 'mystification' of the multitude, as wrought by some skilful impostor, *accounts for* the scribal opposition to Jesus, and is so sound historically that it is reflected long after in the Talmudic description of Jesus as 'Yeshu ha-Notsri, who wrought signs and led Israel astray' (cf. Herford, *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash*, pp. 51, 83).

So ends—let us hope—the discussion of Jesus' 'psychic health' and his 'esthetic temperament,' and the whole psychoanalytic study of Jesus, and the defense of Jesus against such charges—the studies of Stanley Hall, Oskar Holtzmann, A. Schweitzer, Walter Bundy, and others—so far as they hinge about this corrupt reading in the text of Mark. And I am glad to observe that

Lohmeyer is inclined to favor the 'Western' reading here, in his recent commentary in the Meyer series.

6: 3 'Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary, and brother of James, etc.'

The new Chester Beatty papyrus (P<sup>45</sup>) 33 565 700 § it arm bo<sup>codd</sup> eth and Origen probably point to the true text, as does also Luke 4: 22 ουχι υιος εστιν Ιωσηφ ουτος; Moreover, Origen's statement (Contra Cels. vi. 36 = vol. 2, p. 106 G. C. S.) that no ecclesiastical Mss of the Gospels state that Jesus was a carpenter, is not easily to be set aside. Some scholars suspect that it is *Luke* who here preserves the primitive text of Mark; της Μαρίας then was added under the influence of the doctrine of the Virgin Birth. But ουχι, though common in Matt., Luke, and John, is *nowhere* used by Mark; and it is more probable that for once Matt. gives—or approximates—the true reading of Mark: ουχ ουτος εστιν ο του τεκτωνος υιος; (Souter attributes this reading to Matt.) From this reading, Luke's could easily be derived by editorial alteration—but *not* Mark's (or Matthew's) from the reading in Luke. Therefore read ουχ ουτος εστιν ο του τεκτωνος υιος και αδελφος. . . . (At least, certainly the first three words are the same in Matthew and Mark, in any event, and probably the rest followed.)

15: 3 'And the chief priests accused him of many things.' Theta etc. and T R add 'but he answered nothing' (as in A. V.). This I think should be restored. It is required by the sense, implied in vs. 4, and reflected in the parallel in Matthew. Incidentally, it strengthens the view that our Lord really *was* silent before Pilate, a feature which I cannot think was derived by the early tradition from Isaiah 53 ('as a sheep before his shearers is dumb . . .'), but reflects the historical situation—a Galilean peasant-preacher on trial before the Roman governor; a pacifist, if you will, faced with his final ordeal, and making no attempt at self-defence.

14:28 and 16:7 go together—

‘Howbeit, after I am raised up, I will go before you into Galilee.’  
 ‘But go, tell his disciples [and Peter], He goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him, as he said unto you.’

Now I am not at all sure these are glosses or interpolations; but I am very sure that, at the very least, they are secondary elements in the tradition, or rather, two manifestations of one and the same secondary element. 14:28 interrupts the narrative; and Peter goes on, in vs. 29, as if Jesus had said nothing about his resurrection the instant before.

16:7 does the same—the women flee in terror, as they could not have done had they just received the reassuring message that Jesus was risen. And apparently 14:28 has been inserted in order to *explain* the reference in 16:7 *καθως ειπεν υμιν*, i.e. to supply its antecedent, in the same way as the reading of D W it in 13:2 supplies the antecedent of 14:58—the prediction of the destruction of the temple, used as a charge at the trial. It was unthinkable that it could have been otherwise; and if Jesus had made the statement the record should show it.

The two verses on the resurrection and the return to Galilee are not on a par with the historical tradition contained elsewhere in Mark; they represent an attempt to give an account of the Resurrection with which to complete the Gospel; but the account is in entire disagreement with the earliest tradition—as reflected by Paul in I Cor. 15. The whole tradition of the empty tomb, as J. Weiss pointed out, is late. The Resurrection was certainly the primary datum of primitive Christianity; but it did not take place in this fanciful manner. Nor does the Christian faith in the Resurrection of our Lord rest upon such evidence as this. What we have in these two verses is only another, and earlier, attempt to *complete* Mark, similar to the so-called Longer and Shorter Endings.

Note the strange expression: ‘Say to his disciples *and to Peter*,’ found nowhere else in the New Testament (John 20:17 paraphrases: *τοὺς ἀδελφούς μου*), and which is a mark of the gloss—in this case, perhaps, a gloss upon a gloss! This emphasis upon

Peter and upon Galilee suggests *Matthew* as its source; but it existed in Mark before Luke and Matthew used the Gospel. Hence I conclude that it is a very *early* gloss upon the Marcan tradition, if not upon the text of the Gospel of Mark, in the interest of the Galilean rather than the Jerusalem location of the Resurrection Appearances.

Many persons have noted how Luke transforms the saying (which was impossible from his point of view, and knowing the Jerusalem appearances). He reads, 'While he was still with you in Galilee'; and this fairly clearly points to the interest underlying the verses, viz. the *Galilean* appearances, a tradition which receives expression in Matthew and the Appendix to John.

Can we salvage vs. 7a as part of the original text of Mark, and not of the gloss? It is in Mark's style: *υπαγετε | ειπατε | τοις μαθηταις αυτου*—all three expressions are Marcan! But so is *οψεσθε* (found 7 times in Mark). Was the original text as follows:—*αλλα υπαγετε ειπατε τοις μαθηταις αυτου* [gl.] *οτι* [gl.] *αυτον οφονται καθως ειπεν αυτοις* (or, in Mark's style of direct quotation, *αυτον οψεσθε καθως ειπεν υμιν*, as in the present text)?

This is possible, but it is only conjecture. Perhaps a still better solution would be, following Matthew, *ειπατε τοις μαθηταις αυτου οτι ηγερθη και* [st. *εκει*] *αυτον οψεσθε καθως. . .*

But enough of conjectures! My only point is: (1) the verses are secondary, and interrupt the narrative; and they are in each case disregarded by the verse that immediately follows; (2) they help to supply that statement of the Resurrection without which most early readers of Mark must have thought the Gospel defective; and (3) they belong on a par with the Longer and Shorter endings, though so early in date as to be found in all Mss, and hence are not characterized by that only partial attestation which is our clue to the separation of the other endings from the text of the Gospel.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Of course 14:28 is missing in the third century Fayûm fragment at Vienna (cf. Nestle; Legg omits); and in D k, 16:7 is read in the first person singular. These facts point to some uncertainty in the text; but I do not rest the case upon an interpretation of these data.



Clearly there existed a stage in which the Gospel Mss were in process of adaptation, revision, and completion, long before the earliest of our existing manuscripts, versions, or citations emerge above the horizon; and during that period not only did 'each one interpret as best he was able,' as Papias says; but each owner of a manuscript, eager to make it as complete as possible, supplemented it either by the introduction of relevant and often parallel material from another gospel (usually from Matthew—*sy*<sup>s</sup> is an extremely good example) or by the insertion of glosses and additional matter from still other sources than from Gospels. Moreover, since ancient books were often worn and defective at the end—check over, e.g., the list in Legg's *Index Siglorum* (in the new Oxford *Tischendorf*)—it was only natural that additions should be made here more frequently than in the body of the work. This, I think, helps to account for the strange history of the opening verses of Mark, with its gloss from Malachi (via *Q*, or Matthew), and its gradual development of verse 1 into a title. But of that another time!

*Church Congress Syllabus No. 2*

THE CONTENT OF AND AUTHORITY FOR  
CHRISTIAN EVANGELISM

PART III. MODERN CRITICISMS OF THE CHRISTIAN EVANGEL

By PROFESSOR GREGORY VLASTOS, Queen's University

I. PSYCHOLOGICAL CRITICISM

A spurious argument for the validity of Christian beliefs is widely publicized today: their medicinal utility. Anything which produces desirable psychological results, or at least alleviates undesirable ones, it is argued, must be true. But psychiatrists who prescribe religion as a drug are not concerned with the truth. They look upon it as something to take the patient's mind "off" his troubles, to give him faith, peace, inner tranquillity. What kind of faith he gets, and on what conditions he secures peace does not seem to matter to them very much. Anything will do: Theosophy, Christian Science, the Oxford Group, the Roman Catholic Church. And Christian clergymen, pathetically grateful for this psychiatric endorsement, are not often aware of the cynicism which may prompt it. "The true believer," says Freud, "is in a high degree protected against the danger of certain neurotic afflictions; by accepting the universal neurosis he is spared the task of forming a personal neurosis."<sup>1</sup> There is a fearful irony in the fact that this indictment of religion as the universal neurosis should be dished out in more palatable language as a return to religion.

The reason for the persistence of religion, thinks Freud, is the lingering childishness of the human race. The infant is innocently and absolutely ego-centric. He knows only his own wishes. Others are ministers and instruments. Their friend-

<sup>1</sup> *The Future of an Illusion*, p. 77.

liness and love mean to him: they give me what I want. The passage to emotional maturity requires a deep disillusionment. He must accept the fact that his wishes do not legislate for reality. He must learn a new kind of love, which is not possessive, but mutuality and community. We all know how difficult is this transition from childish ego-centricity to mature mutuality. Few ever fully achieve it. For most it is a precarious possession, with frequent lapses into the unregenerate egotism of the child. Religion, thinks Freud, is one of those lapses. It puts us back again into the center of a universe designed and administered to protect us from frustration; where an infinitely solicitous Love hovers over our head to cater to our wishes; where all that we ask will be given us, if only we propitiate the will of this omnipotent Father.

Is Freud wrong? We shall never prove him wrong until we base our religious beliefs on objective evidence, not on subjective wishes. We are all familiar with the type of apologetics which "proves" the truth of traditional doctrines through the "needs of the human heart." We need to believe that the universe is friendly; therefore, a personal God exists. I remember hearing a fellow-student at the Seminary voice a doubt on immortality. "Wait till you look into the face of a mother who has lost a son," was the answer; "you will *know* that you must tell her that she will see her loved one again." This kind of argument plays entirely into Freud's hands. It says in effect: We wish deeply that this should be so. Therefore, it must be so. The alternative is too terrible to envisage; therefore, it cannot exist.

There is a religious demand for objectivity which is at least as cogent as the psychological one. A God (or any other object of religious faith) who is made to the order of human wishes is an idol. The prophets poured contempt on those who worshipped the work of their hands. If they lived today they would have equal scorn for those who worship the products of their dreams. A man-made God, a creature of the creature, a psychiatric prescription—it is sacrilege to confuse these things with the Lord who commands our absolute devotion. If such a Lord exists,

he must be sought and found in the structure of reality itself; not in the figments of our fancies and desires. And if we are after reality we must adopt the only method which can be trusted to reveal it: persistent questioning, patient observation, honest reasoning.

## 2. SOCIAL CRITICISM

The moral philosophy of Marx centers in the *humanity* of man. This sounds like the merest tautology. But it cuts deeps as a demand that man be treated as a man—not as a machine, nor as an animal. Medieval society, for example, was essentially sub-human, for it subordinated the human fact of personal ability and character to the biological fact of birth. The same criticism applied, of course, to more recent conceptions which exalt race as the supreme value: they grade men by the animal norm of blood. What Marx indicts is the materialism of our society: It degrades human beings into commodities, bought and sold on the open market, like every other commodity. Morally capitalism is of a piece with slavery; both treat men not as spiritual beings, but as things. The essential dignity of personality, said Kant, consists in every man's being an end in himself, never merely a means to others' ends. Exploitation is the violation of this essential dignity. Or, in Hegelian terms, it is the alienation of man's life. His life is taken away from him. It is no longer his, but his employer's; or rather it belongs to those inhuman conditions under which his employer must compete with other employers in the exploitation of men for the production of profit.

Yet even in the darkest hours of history, when men had no hope of breaking their material bonds, they could not surrender their essential nature altogether. They could not discover it in their everyday world; so they sought it in an ideal world. Their material life was sordid, oppressed, insecure; they found refuge in an imaginary life of purity, freedom, and peace:

"Religion is the self-consciousness and the self-feeling of man who has not found himself or has lost himself again. . . .

"It is the fantastic actualization of human nature, when this human nature has no true actuality. . . .

"Religious want is both the expression of actual want and a protest against it. Religion is the groan of the oppressed creature, the heart of a heartless world, the spirit of unspiritual conditions."<sup>2</sup>

Thus religion is not a disease, but an assertion of what is deepest in man. If it were a disease, then the logical thing would be to exterminate it. But if you exterminated religion, what would be left? Man without even this imaginary expression of his humanity; the disillusioned man, more inhuman than ever. Marx would have protested against the facile atheism of Freud, as he objected to the atheistic young Hegelians of his day: You do not give man the reality by robbing him of his dreams. Create the conditions which lend spiritual dignity to man's natural life, and he will need no escape in the supernatural. Man's enemy is not the religion which offers him an escape, but the conditions which make escape necessary. Religion becomes his enemy only when it blocks the effort to change those conditions. When it allies itself with a corrupt social order, then it must perish with its ally, it must be destroyed for its betrayal of man.

Marx would have no difficulty to find religion, including the Christian religion, playing such a disreputable role in human affairs. We need not think here of the worst, but the best, of Christians. St Augustine's justification of slavery is not as thoroughgoing as Aristotle's; but it is less excusable, for it came at a moment when European history was in the very act of throwing slavery aside as an outworn garment. Slavery, he wrote in the *City of God*,

"comes not to pass but by the direction of the highest, in whom is no injustice. . . . And it is a happier servitude to serve man than lust. . . . As humility does benefit the servant, so does pride endamage the superior."

He excused it upon earth with the certainty that it would vanish in heaven. In the meanwhile,

"masters are to endure more labor in their government, than the slaves in their servitude. If any be disobedient, and offend this just peace, he is forth-

<sup>2</sup>Freely translated from an early essay of Marx "*Zur Kritik der Hegel'schen Philosophie*." This and much else of the early work of Marx is not yet available in English.

with to be corrected, with strokes, or some other convenient punishment, whereby he may be reingrafted into the peaceful stock from whence his disobedience has torn him."<sup>3</sup>

He who justified slavery in the fourth century could justify capitalism in the twentieth, for much the same reasons, and with the same advice for "reingrafting" strikers into "the peaceful stock from whence their disobedience has torn them."

When one surveys the various bribes that every society has offered its holy men (broad phylacteries, salutations in the marketplace, chief seats at feasts, and even widows' houses), and notes how faithfully the holy men have rendered divine sanction for human privilege, one cannot but admit that there is truth in Marx's accusation: religion has often been a drug. It has made servitude more tolerable as the will of God than it could ever have been as the mere will of man; and it has thus prolonged it.

Yet it has also been the very opposite of a drug. How can we forget the encounter between the priest of Bethel and the shepherd of Tekoah? The religion which sides with the oppressed against their oppressors is not a common phenomenon in history. But neither can it be ignored. It is the faith of Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Jesus. It seems hardly necessary to prolong such a list. Yet not only Marx, but eminent Christian scholars, pass it over in silence. Professor A. E. Taylor writes a paper on "The Constant Element in Evangelism," without alluding to it once. "Christianity," he tells us, "invented no fresh 'duties to one's neighbour.'" But it did. The priest and the levite knew the great commandment. But they did not know—did not wish to know perhaps—that material service to a fellow man's material need takes precedence over professional spirituality; that, in fact, it constitutes love. To the priest and the levite love meant charity:

"If all men were equal, all rich or all poor, who would perform the loving kindness of truth of Psalm lxi? . . . This theory, that the poor are necessary to the rich, runs through the Jewish theory of almsgiving and charity in all subsequent ages."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Book XIX, 15, 16. After John Healey's translation.

<sup>4</sup> I. Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, First Series, pp. 116f.



To Jesus it meant a classless fellowship, which broke down anything that made for class-divisions: whether it be the rich man's wealth or the Pharisee's aristocratic holiness. That kind of ethic initiates men into a new world of duties—new to Jewish rabbis, and Greek moralists. But is this religion? So much so, Jesus believed, that anything else was hypocrisy, unreal religion.

Marx might object that such protests for justice were ineffective, for they were based upon a belief in the supernatural: they undid the efficacy of their appeal for righteousness by basing it on the promise of miraculous divine intervention. But the prophets did not create supernatural beliefs and expectations. They absorbed them from the mental atmosphere of their time. In a pre-scientific age it is not remarkable that religious reformers should clothe their gospel in other-worldly form. The Messianic Kingdom of Jesus was not his own invention, but the common heritage of his people. What is remarkable is Jesus' use of that idea: his shift from popular apocalyptic to ethical eschatology. He does not dwell on consoling visions of the miraculous deliverance; he does not employ the Kingdom as a fantasy to relieve present frustration, and soothe its critical tension. He thinks of it rather as an immediate demand which intensified the urgency of present action. For all its other-worldly staging, Jesus' Kingdom was ominously this-worldly. As Dr Hardy points out in the first paper of this series, the Kingdom was to be established on earth; it was 'a state of affairs, not a state of mind.' The same is true of the prophets. God's justice was a threat to the aggressors, a demand for righteousness, not a consolation to the victims of unrighteousness. One need only compare the outlook of these simple men with that of learned priests in Egypt and enlightened philosophers in Athens, to appreciate the naturalism of the prophets. Plato's *Phaidon* is steeped in other-worldliness. The prophets hardly mention the after-life. Their concern is with visible right or wrong living in the here and now.

But the final answer to the charge that religion is superstition has yet to be given. Only an age in which science has come completely into its own could attempt a thorough resolution of the

conflict between religious experience and scientific method. Only in recent years has religion seriously attempted to shed both the crude other-worldliness of popular imagination and the refined other-worldliness of idealistic philosophy.

### 3. PHILOSOPHICAL CRITICISM

Our traditional theology is largely the work of great rationalists in the second, third, and fourth centuries of the Christian era, who used the categories of Platonic philosophy to elucidate Christian experience. Their philosophy, clothed with all the moral authority of the gospel and the institutional authority of the church, remained substantially intact for some fifteen centuries. It was never seriously questioned till the re-birth of science in the seventeenth century. Its first formidable critics were Hume and Kant in the eighteenth century. Their critique of speculative theology still receives periodic "refutations," and remains unanswered. Hegel in the nineteenth century attempted a complete re-casting of idealistic metaphysics; the most ambitious speculative effort since the great days of Greek philosophy. The result was magnificent, and unconvincing. Idealism has steadily lost ground since his time. The creative philosophy of recent years has been largely a revolt against idealism. Such great names as Bergson, C. S. Peirce, James, Alexander, Santayana, Husserl, Nicolai Hartmann, Whitehead, Dewey, are all in other camps.

The essence of idealism is the belief in the superior reality of the idea over material fact. "Superior reality" is a vague expression; idealists have made various attempts to define it, and specify the precise sense in which the world we see and touch is a "shadow" or "copy" (to use Plato's words) of the invisible Idea. In spite of their differences, they are ultimately agreed that the unreality of the material world is due to its transience. The Idea is eternal. Material fact is temporal: it is a "perpetual perishing." Therefore, the highest reality must be somehow "above" change and "above" the material world. God

must be a transcendent Idea, or, to preserve a more personal pattern, a "transcendent intelligence."

Now the dominant conviction of recent philosophy is the precise opposite of this: the reality of time. It does not begin with the certainty of the Absolute Idea, but with the certainty of the "brute facts" of our everyday experience; and these are essentially temporal. From such a point of view it finds it very difficult to maintain a belief in a timeless deity. For how can timeless Being be related to a world of becoming, without being infected by the timefulness of the latter? God creates the world. To create is to act, to produce changes, to be involved in a process. A creative God is a timeful God.

Whitehead's philosophy may be regarded as an attempt to recall God into the world of time from which Greek theology had banished him. His essay on pure metaphysics is entitled significantly enough "*Process and Reality*." He puts aside the traditional concept of God ("a concept which is clear, terrifying, and unprovable"),<sup>5</sup> and turns from dogma to experience. What is it, he asks, that is disclosed in religious experience?

"There is a large concurrence in the negative doctrine that this religious experience does not include any direct intuition of a definite person or individual."<sup>6</sup>

It is rather an intuition of "a character of permanent rightness in the nature of things."<sup>7</sup>

Whitehead takes a long step away from the Greek ideal of Divine immobility. God is the order of temporal nature; and this order is itself in the making. Temporal fact passes, but does not altogether perish. It "contributes its quality as an immortal fact to the order which informs the world."<sup>8</sup>

Yet the break with Idealism is incomplete. This order which is in process is nevertheless, Whitehead thinks, ideally complete; and the desire to conserve both of these incompatible ideas—a

<sup>5</sup> *Religion in the Making*, p. 75.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 61.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 80.

<sup>8</sup> *Religion in the Making*, p. 80.

growing physical harmony and a complete 'primordial' harmony—puts an intolerable strain on the unity of Whitehead's theology. God splits in two: the "primordial appetite" and the "consequent nature."<sup>9</sup> The first is the Platonic survival: pure idea and pure timelessness. The second is the realistic outreach: the God who shares in "the creative advance" of the world. With the honesty of a great thinker, Whitehead prefers the residual incoherence to a camouflage of the difficulty. He leaves for his successors the more radical venture of cutting loose altogether from Platonic idealism, and describing that "permanent character in the nature of things" in terms of temporal endurance, not ideal timelessness.

Other philosophers have made notable contributions in this new direction. In his *Quest for Certainty*, Dewey shows how deeply the history of thought has been influenced by the age-old exaltation of "arts of acceptance" at the expense of "arts of control." The first is the mood of resignation, which prompts escape into an ideal world of changeless perfection. The second is the mood of intelligent effort, which admits the imperfections of the world in the spirit of courageous reconstruction. Dewey pleads for the religious dignity of the latter: that it is more worthy of religious faith and dedication to realize the ideal, than to idealize the real; and that God can be more worthily conceived as the dynamic unity of those ideal possibilities that stir us to action than as the static unity of a "completed ideal harmony."

Wieman goes further. He sees the danger of attempting to define God, as Dewey does, in terms of ideals. Ideals are man-made things: brittle, pretentious, as even the best of human aspirations become when they are not humbled by a sense of man's dependence upon the structure of environing reality. There is that in the world about us—not in an ideal perfection beyond the world—which is the source of all our values, the sustainer of our efforts, the determiner of our destiny. That is God: the highest good that demands our supreme loyalty, and evokes our

<sup>9</sup> *Process and Reality*, Part V.

highest devotion. Our knowledge of him is necessarily tentative and partial. Reverence for the unknown God will preserve us from arrogant claims of finality for our dogmas. Hence any descriptions of God are only provisional: the "principle of integration"; the "growing community of meaning and value"; "the power which makes us one."

It may be long before philosophy finds a concept of God which is as adequate to the realism of our own day as that of the great Alexandrians was to the idealism of their day. The philosopher can only order and clarify a living experience. A new philosophy must wait upon the growth of a new experience. And our greatest need here is to recover the early discovery of *agape* in terms which are relevant to the life of today. We live in a society torn by conflict. There is a fatal temptation for middle-class people—and the majority of professing Christians are in that category—to seek aloofness from the struggle. Then religious experience strikes a note of nostalgic solitariness, and they reach out in romantic loyalty to the "universe." But the genius of Christianity is not communion with the stars. It is communion with God-in-man. It is finding, by losing, oneself not in cosmic reverie, but in material comradeship with the man who fell among thieves. Its central rite celebrates sacrificial fellowship: the body broken for man, the blood shed for man. And its central doctrine must affirm the God who *is* love.

That affirmation is sentimental on the lips of anyone who has not come face to face with the titanic forces which generate hate in the world today; and the bane of modern religious utterance is its sentimentality. Therein lies the contribution of Reinhold Niebuhr. More than any other book of recent years, his *Moral Man and Immoral Society* has forced American Christians away from reformist well-wishing into a recognition of the class-struggle. John Macmurray, equally aware of the essentially irreligious nature of capitalist society, has defined the religious convictions which determine the Christian's participation in the class-struggle:

1. Religion is "about human community."
2. Community is achieved or forfeited in action, not in idea. "Idealism is a pathological condition of the human mind."
3. Any religion which clings to an affirmation of ideal community, while it tolerates its material violation, is "an imaginary religion." It is "pseudo-religion," and its characteristic symptom is retreat from the natural world of action to a supernatural world of imagination.
4. The Christian goal is the material achievement of personality-in-community.

#### 4. CRITICISM OF DR TAYLOR'S "CONSTANT ELEMENT IN EVANGELISM"

Let us now turn to Professor A. E. Taylor's essay on "The Constant Element in Christian Evangelism."

It strikes me as the evangel of Christian Platonism. It is the evangel of the Alexandrine Greeks which still remains largely the message of traditional theology. But it is hardly the message which Jesus preached when he came down from Galilee, saying, "The Kingdom of God is at hand. Repent ye, and believe the Gospel." Let me explain.

Salvation for the philosophers of Plato's *Republic* consists in escape from the shadow-world of the cave to the ideal reality beyond. When the philosophers return, it is only to order the cave's affairs, not to proclaim a like deliverance to its prisoners. Let us imagine now Plato, converted to Christianity, but as much of an idealist as ever. He has a gospel now for everyone in the cave, not merely for the *élite*, but for artisans and slaves as well. And what salvation does he promise the slaves? That they too can be liberated from time to eternity: what they cannot do for themselves, God has done for them through Jesus Christ; they can have "eternal life" as a free gift. This will unite them with the philosophers in a fellowship of knowledge and adoration; and it will fill them with enthusiasm for good works. They will no longer be slaves to sin. But will they still be slaves to men? Yes.

Is this unfair to Dr Taylor? He has not told us that he believes in slavery. No one does today. Yet St Augustine did;



and his view of "the constant element of evangelism" was practically identical with Dr Taylor's. He believes, as we have seen, that God's great gift of "eternal life" to the slave simply made him a better slave. There are things in contemporary life which condemn millions to comparable meaninglessness, frustration, and bondage. Dr Taylor does not mention them. He does speak of the menace of war, and approves of the "open" society which transcends racial and national antagonisms. If he goes so far he might perhaps go further, and condemn also the system of property which creates antagonistic social classes. Perhaps he takes all this for granted. But the significant thing is that he does not include it as an inherent part of the Christian evangel. His evangel concerns a spiritual relation to a transcendent God. It does not concern material relations to one's fellow-man. This latter might be a by-product of the former. But it is not as such the meaning of eternal life.

The gospel which Jesus preached did concern directly these material relations. It was addressed to the poor. The rich were all but excluded from it so long as they retained their wealth. It announced a complete transformation of human relations. Autocratic power would vanish; and in its place would come a society in which the servant was greatest of all. It would come on earth, and it would come soon. Like a thief in the night, like a bridegroom's sudden arrival, it would break in upon the world. There is no echo of this urgent imminence in Dr Taylor's account. The substance of Jesus' preaching was that something would happen very soon that would free the captives. And the mood of his announcement was tense expectancy, not reverent reminiscence of something done for man two thousand years ago, which brought the captives the spiritual gift of eternal life, but left their material chains intact.

It all comes back to the question: What do we mean by the proposition that God is love? Dr Taylor takes it to mean a supernatural transaction in which God delivered man from the world of time. For thousands of years God had, for some obscure reason, withheld this gift. But at a certain point of history God

suddenly enabled man to abolish history. This is Christian idealism: the enemy is time, and salvation is eternity. Christian realism takes the proposition that God is love quite literally. The love that we know in this world of time is our revelation of God. This does not mean that God is an attribute of man. God is the creative structure of reality in and through which man realizes his humanity in love.

Such a faith can face unshaken every modern criticism. Its God is not an illusion, unless love be an illusion. It is not an infantile regression. The capacity for community is the test of one's emotional maturity, the measure of one's victory over egocentricity. It is not a flight into the supernatural. Love is the most natural thing in our experience, though it be the most divine. It is not sanction for oppression, but revolutionary protest against it. To the slave, and to the slave's master, it means: so long as there is slavery, God is denied; acquiescence to slavery is acquiescence in the denial of God; it is the confession that one does *not* believe in God. This makes a rationalization of human exploitation unthinkable, and a tolerance of exploitation a religious impossibility. It is a dynamic faith; devotion to God means dedication to the kingdom of love. It does not believe that participation in the struggle for justice interrupts or suspends communion with God. God is enjoyed even as he is served. For God is in the world: the power which makes us one; the order of permanent rightness which makes love the way of life, and anything else than love the way of frustration and death.

#### *Books for Study*

##### I. Psychological Criticism:

1. Freud: *The Future of an Illusion* (Hogarth Press).

A forthright indictment of religion. Quite short. Requires no previous acquaintance with psycho-analytic theory.

2. Suttie: *The Origins of Love and Hate* (Kegan Paul).

The best answer I know to Freudian psychological theory and psychology of religion. The work of a practicing psychotherapist, which has profound religious significance.

## II. Social Criticism:

1. Raven, Macmurray, Lewis, and others: *Christianity and the Social Revolution* (Gollancz).

Julius Hecker's essay in this volume is a responsible statement of the Russian communist view of Christianity. Polanyi's essay on "Fascism" and Macmurray's essay on "The early development of Marx's thought" are of great importance for the religious understanding of fascist and communist theory. Much else of great value in this volume.

2. Scott, Vlastos, and others: *Toward the Christian Revolution* (Willett, Clark & Co.).

A manifesto of revolutionary Christianity.

3. Macmurray: *Creative Society* (Student Christian Movement Press).

A study of the relation between Christianity and communism, which is, at the same time, one of the most important recent re-interpretations of Christian philosophy.

## III. Philosophical Criticism:

1. Whitehead: *Religion in the Making* (Macmillan).

A great metaphysical essay on religion. Should be supplemented by Part V of *Process and Reality*. Those who find Whitehead's metaphysics too hard can approach him more easily through Chapter XII of *Science and the Modern World* and Chapter X of *Adventures of Ideas*.

2. Dewey: *The Quest for Certainty*.

Easier than Whitehead, but still no "light" reading. *A Common Faith* (Yale University Press) is simpler and shorter. Both are challenging books.

3. H. N. Wieman: *Religious Experience and Scientific Method* (Macmillan).

Clearly written, thoroughly sound, and honest.

4. Reinhold Niebuhr: *Moral Man and Immoral Society* (Scribner).

A stimulating Christian philosophy of society.

## DOM McCANN'S SAINT BENEDICT

By CYRIL C. RICHARDSON, Union Theological Seminary

*St Benedict.* By Dom Justin McCann. Sheed and Ward, 1937, pp. 301. \$2.75.

This addition to the rapidly growing literature on St Benedict has much in its favour. Dom McCann, the Master of St Benet's Hall, Oxford, has combined charm with sound scholarship in his biography. There has long been needed a readable English work which incorporated the results of recent research on Benedict and his Rule. It is true that the wider field was surveyed by Abbot Cuthbert Butler in his important work *Benedictine Monachism* (2nd ed. 1924), to which Dom McCann pays due respect. But the need for a good book dealing specifically with St Benedict has been admirably fulfilled by the present volume.

Dom John Chapman's book, *St Benedict and the Sixth Century*, (1929) was replete with learning but suffered from a somewhat paradoxical and unsound judgment, while Abbot Ferdinand Cabrol's *St Benedict* (1934) and Abbot Ildefons Herwegen's *St Benedict, a Character Study* (1924), were too brief to take account of the more technical advances in the field. Furthermore, since these works were published, two significant contributions from the continent have appeared. Terrence McLaughlin's *Le très ancien Droit monastique de l'Occident* (1935) is a careful study of the juridical development of monasticism, and Karl Heussi's *Der Ursprung des Monchtums* (1936) thoroughly reviews the whole field of the origins of monachism.

The first part of Dom McCann's work (chh. i to vii) tells the story of St Benedict with simplicity and sympathy. After an opening chapter which gives some account of the Western Empire in the days of that Saint, the author closely follows the second book of the *Dialogues* of St Gregory (the only trustworthy source we possess for the life of St Benedict), and a number of the incidents are recounted in Gregory's own words. Dom McCann has not omitted the miracles which Gregory attributed to the saint. A number of them are told with religious feeling. This is certainly a better procedure than that of the rationalistic historian, who denies their authenticity on grounds more of faith (or lack of it) than of history.

Something of the character of Benedict and life of the monastery at Monte Cassino is gleaned from the Rule. This document is given special attention in chapters viii to ix. An excellent account of its textual history is given (ch. viii), and a careful examination is made of the second vow (ch. ix). The meaning of the disputed "*promitto de . . . conversatione morum suorum*" is dealt with at length. The author points out the difficulty involved in the theory that *conversatio* is the equivalent of *conversio*, as this active sense of *conversatio* is extremely rare. On the other hand, he is unwilling to accept Abbot Chapman's translation

"monasticity of behaviour"—not only because of the barbarism of the phrase, but because *conversatio* is a general word for "behaviour" or "mode of life" and can hardly have been a technical term for the monastic life. This thesis is ably supported by a minute examination of its use in the *Vita Pachomii* (in the Latin translation by Dionysius Exiguus), a document omitted by Dom Chapman in his review of the evidence, but which was certainly known to Benedict.

Both from these usages and from the other nine occurrences of the word in the Rule, Dom McCann establishes that it means "behaviour" in general. It only takes on a monastic note in special contexts, and then usually with a qualifying adjective. Such an epithet the author finds in the genitive *morum*, which he takes as a genitive of definition (p. 162, n. 1). He would translate the phrase "moral conduct" (p. 166), with special reference to the discipline and life of Benedict's Rule as a whole. "It is clear," he writes, "that he is thinking of a moral ascesis, a discipline of character and life" (p. 166). For a concise and simple form of the threefold vow in English, he offers the suggestion, "Stability, Self-discipline, Obedience" (p. 167).

In dealing with the life of the Rule (ch. xi), Dom McCann makes some pointed remarks about the current antithesis of the active and the contemplative life. He holds that this antithesis is itself misleading, for the terms are complementary rather than mutually exclusive. Benedict provided for prayer as well as for activity in his Rule, and it would be wrong to think that it excluded the *vita contemplativa*. What, however, it does exclude is the solitary life of the hermit, whose mystical contemplation Cassian regarded as more sublime than the life of the cenobite. Benedict does not legislate for hermits, but he may, in theory at least, "have accepted the tradition and regarded the eremitical life as higher than the life of the cenobite" (p. 170). There is, however, no very definite evidence for it. Benedict's shrewd and common sense, which is reflected in every page of Gregory, must have been well aware of the dangers that beset the lonely hermit. Indeed, his own experiences in Subiaco may lie behind his description of the cenobites as "the strongest sort" of monks.

The remaining chapters of the book deal with the closing years of Benedict, the translation of his bones to France (an incident which Dom McCann with good reason regards as authentic), and a brief sketch of the future history of Benedictinism. The author accepts the traditional date of Benedict's birth (480), but he puts his death around 547 (p. 210), which is more conservative and probably better than Dom Chapman's 555. A number of appendices are added to the book. They deal with the *Dialogues*, Mark the Poet, Paul the Deacon, St Maurus and St Placid, and include a short bibliography. Two photographs from MSS of the Rule and a map of central Italy complete the volume.

One regrets that only a single page (97) and a few scattered references are devoted to the *Offices* in the monastic life—a subject discussed more fully by Dom Cabrol (*St Benedict*, pp. 69ff.). Another emphasis which is lacking is that Benedict *romanised* monasticism. This is everywhere implied by the author, but never explicitly stated. Benedict made the monastery a self-sufficient community, distinguished by its social spiritual life, its healthy activity, and its moderate asceticism. All these are typically Roman virtues. Moreover, there

was no vow of poverty. The Benedictine monastery was to *give* rather than to *receive* alms. It was to be the center of agriculture, learning, and charity, rather than to be a parasite on society. For all this, and even to some extent for the fostering of learning (see p. 202),<sup>1</sup> the West is indebted to St Benedict.

All in all we are deeply grateful to Dom McCann for a treatment, at once sympathetic and sound, of one of the greatest figures in the history of monasticism.

<sup>1</sup> The opposition between Benedict and Cassiodorus has often been pressed too far, notably by Hodgkin.



## BOOK REVIEWS

*The Book of Ezekiel.* By G. A. Cooke. Scribner, 1937, 2 vols., pp. xlvii + 558. \$8.00.

Students of the Old Testament have long been awaiting the International Critical Commentary on Ezekiel, and now that it has appeared it proves well worth waiting for. Its timeliness also is enhanced by the fact that it follows so much of the recent criticism of the Book of Ezekiel. Upon this Dr. Cooke passes judgment, rejecting Hölscher's radical view as "emptying the Book of all serious value," and handing over Torrey's theory of a Pseudo-Ezekiel as a "daring *tour de force*" to be dealt with by Spiegel. Hertrich's thesis of a Palestinian Ezekiel and a Babylonian redactor he takes more seriously, but sets it aside as based (like Hölscher's) upon "à priori views of what is possible and not possible in the domain of the Spirit," and as not offering any real relief. He prefers Herrmann's more conservative analysis and exposition, to which he acknowledges himself much in debt. Bertholet's *Hesekiel* (Tübingen, 1936; see A.T.R. XIX, p. 135f) seems unfortunately not to have been published until after Dr Cooke's commentary was completed.

In his own analysis of the Book the author takes on the whole a conservative position. Recognizing freely (as does Herrmann) that later hands have everywhere been busy touching up and reshaping the original, he none the less attributes the bulk of the Book to Ezekiel himself. The only large blocks of material that he regards as secondary are the prophecies concerning Gog of Magog (38: 1-39: 20) and parts of 40-48, which describe the temple and community of the future (43: 13-27; 44: 25-27, 31; 45-48 except 46: 19-24 and 47: 1-12. Bertholet, on the contrary, accepts most of 45-48 as Ezekiel's).

Ezekiel, Dr Cooke believes, actually worked among the exiles by the "river Chebar" (1: 3) in Babylonia. Why then do his prophecies deal with conditions in remote Judah? This question, which led Torrey, Smith, Hertrich and even Bertholet to deny that the oracles of doom were uttered in Babylonia, is handled rather briefly by the author. Ezekiel's "words might reach only the ears that were listening, but his attention was fixed upon the nation at large. Mere distance does not count in the range of a prophet's message. Isaiah, Nahum, Zephaniah, Jeremiah could address nations far away from Jerusalem; why not Ezekiel in the opposite direction?" The prophet's acquaintance with what was going on in Judah could have been gained by letter or by "second sight," and his silence regarding conditions in Babylonia was probably due to his absorption in Israel's apostasy and inevitable doom (pp. xxiv, 123).

So much for the critical introduction. The commentary (p. 1ff), which necessarily goes into great detail, avoids the fatal pit of dullness. It can even be read *in extenso* with interest and profit. The author's interpretation is fresh and helpful. Particularly good are the frequent passages in which he pauses to discuss and generalize upon the ideas involved in the text (e.g. the vision p. 28ff,

Ezekiel's speechlessness p. 47f, the new covenant p. 180, retribution p. 182 etc.). His comment is not hurried, neither is it verbose. He tells the reader the things he needs to know and explains what needs to be explained—too rare a virtue in commentaries! His book is a mine of historical, archaeological and philological lore, with a rich vein of Old Testament theology added.

Throughout the commentary Dr Cooke keeps the reader in touch with the opinions of other commentators, stopping at times to state and discuss these at some length. Nor does he ever allow one to lose sight of the leading ideas of Ezekiel himself.

As a critic Dr Cooke is characterised by fairness, moderation and sound judgment. He has a way of throwing the burden of proof upon those who deny the authenticity of a passage, rather than upon the passage itself. "There is no reason," he will say, "why Ezekiel could not have written this." Just here it may be remarked that the reader would be much aided by a *translation* (such as is found in the usual German commentary) which would exhibit the author's critical analysis at a glance by means of various kinds of type.

Upon the critical and philological notes appended to each section of the commentary it would be difficult to pass judgment without a much longer use of them than has been possible for the present reviewer. Where sampled they have proved adequate and helpful.

Looking upon the book as a whole it must be pronounced an outstanding commentary which will fill the need of the modern student for a long while to come. Its critical position will not indeed satisfy every one. In a field where so many radical views have recently been put forth its conservatism will doubtless lay it open in some minds to the charge of being old-fashioned. The present reviewer, however, welcomes its conservatism as a return to health. He suspects that it (along with Bertholet's commentary) will prove more durable than the contemporary modes of radicalism.

While possibly not as brilliant as the commentary of A. B. Davidson, Dr Cooke's *Ezekiel* is written in clear, vigorous and pleasing style; it is full of thought and learning; and best of all, it is *religious*. Indeed, as the author himself says (p. vi), it is his belief "in the action of the divine Spirit upon the human" that has ultimately conditioned his critical point of view.

This is a book to own and use.

FLEMING JAMES.

*The Two Sources of the Predeuteronomiac Primeval History (JE) in Gen. 1-11;* (Avhandlingar utgitt av det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo; II. Hist. Filos. Klasse 1937. No. 2). By Sigmund Mowinckel. Oslo: I Kommissjon hos Jacob Dybwad, 1937, pp. 84. Kr. 5,00.

By "predeuteronomiac" in his title, Mowinckel means to indicate the content of the cited chapters of Genesis "after the P portions have been deleted." From a series of inconsistencies and contradictions he deduces that there are here two sources which he describes, from the parallel genealogies in 4: 17f and 4: 25f, as the Kainite and the Sethite strands. These he then traces in detail so far as they are preserved, and moves on to the important conclusion that they are not, as commonly supposed, two strands of J material but really J and E. In other

words, he argues that the E document actually begins with the creation, just as J and P, and not at chapter 13, as has come to be the orthodoxy of criticism. In his final chapter he discusses the Babylonian influence in the section; it is discernible mainly in three matters: the antediluvian patriarchs, the flood, and the tradition regarding Nimrod. Of these J contains only the Nimrod tradition, the geographical references of which show that it was not prior in origin to 1300, and Mowinckel inclines to the view that it may have migrated into Canaan somewhat late. The evidence on the flood story he believes to be more definite; it was "not handed down by J but by E. And E wrote in the Babylonian period, after Israel and Judah had been subject to Assyrian and Babylonian rule for 150 years" (that is, he agrees with Hölscher that E is subsequent to 586).

That the material here treated is not homogeneous has long been recognized; its inconsistencies cannot be denied. But Mowinckel has set the matter in fresh clarity by his discerning analysis. For many, though, it will appear that he has weakened his case with overstrain. Some of his disagreements are highly dubious; in cases they rest on a failure to assess the Hebrew idiom. That the flaming sword (3: 24) is a "parallel" of the cherubim is a view that can be maintained only by ignoring the indisputable use of hendiadys by the Hebrew writers. Similarly the view that 3: 23 is a "parallel" of vs. 24 will carry weight only when we overlook the idiomatic uses of the conjunction *waw*. And when he singles out from 2: 7 the one word *'aphar* as indicative of duplication we seem to be back in the Hexateuchal analysis of fifty years ago when half-verses and single words were separated into constituent documents with an omniscient certainty such as no mortal may attain. Unfortunately we have not yet learned adequately that before concluding the existence of disagreements in Biblical passages we must first exhaust all possible means of harmonising them. It would have been better if Mowinckel had admitted a higher measure of uncertainty in many of his details.

Yet such friendly criticism must not obscure the importance of his brief study, which is quite out of proportion to its bulk. To have the presence and the features of the E document in the primeval saga demonstrated by a scholar of the ability and recognized standing of Mowinckel is a matter of first rate importance in Old Testament criticism. His discussion of the period of Israel's susceptibility to Babylonian influence is likewise of far-reaching significance, even if many Old Testament workers may yet be less impressed than he with Hölscher's late dating of the E document.

W. A. IRWIN.

*Judaism and Christianity*. Volume i. *The Age of Transition*. Ed. by W. O. E. Oesterley. Macmillan, 1937, pp. xii + 304 + 1 chart. \$4.00.

This is the first volume of a two-volume collection of essays by Professors Oesterley, Hooke, James and Loewe. The essays were originally delivered as lectures at King's College, London, during the winter of 1935-36. The first (by Dr Oesterley) deals with the general historical background and sketches the political history from Alexander to the fall of Jerusalem. It is somewhat unfortunate that the scale is too fine in the first part of the lecture—it would have been better had Herod and the Procurators been drawn upon the same scale as

the preceding figures in Jewish history. Dr E. O. James writes chapter two, which is on religion in the Graeco-Roman world, an admirable outline of the development of Greek religion from primitive times onward. Good as the chapter is on the popular religions, it is not so certain that everyone will agree with the author that 'philosophy had degenerated into counsels of despair' or that 'Judaism was a spent force, notwithstanding the efforts of Philo' (pp. 55-56). We are very suspicious of these wholesale indictments.

The next two chapters are by Professor Oesterley and deal with the Wisdom and the Apocalyptic literatures. These chapters are quite in the style of popular lectures, indeed may well have been broadcast, and are quite charming and delightful as essays. However, in the second one the author maintains that the Apocalyptists were *speakers* first of all, before they became writers, and that their messages were delivered orally. This may have been true in certain periods, e.g. during the Maccabean revolt when the Book of Daniel was written; but surely as time went on and such books as Enoch, IV Ezra, II Baruch were written, Apocalyptism developed into an esoteric literary tradition.

The pièce de résistance of the volume is Herbert Loewe's great essay upon Pharisaism (pp. 105-190). It is in line with the researches of Moore, Herford, Taylor, Abrahams, Montefiore, Büchler, and others, viz. Pharisaism was by no means a reactionary movement in Judaism, nor did it represent a cold crystallization of the Jewish spirit. It was on the contrary a progressive movement, and the conditions under which it made progress were laid down antecedently by the fact that Judaism was the religion of a revelation enshrined in a sacred law, which law had come down from a distant past and contemplated for the most part conditions of more or less primitive agrarian life in early Palestine. What the Pharisees had to do was to take that old law and make it work under conditions as intricate and as urban as those of the first century. That they did not wholly fail is clear to anyone with an eye for spiritual values. The day has certainly come when Christians ought to stop interpreting Pharisaism—and all later Judaism, which stood under its influence—in terms of those particular Pharisees who were castigated by our Lord in the Gospel. (Or rather, perhaps, were castigated by the compiler of M, whose expansion of our Lord's sayings underlies Matt. 23.)

Mr Loewe's view of our Lord is interesting. He regards him as "a saintly artisan, of Hillel's type. Unlike Hillel, he did not study, consequently he took no part in *Halakhah*. He had no responsibility, and he was free to devote himself to popular ethical teaching and evangelistic work of the highest order. . . . I do not believe that he claimed a mystic or supernatural power to forgive sins" (pp. 160-1).

This article is followed by one on Belief in Angels and Demons, by Dr Oesterley, and the remaining chapters are from the pen of S. H. Hooke, on the Way of the Initiate, Christianity and the Mystery Religions, the Emergence of Christianity from Judaism. Professor Hooke is very sure that there are no traces of mysticism in Judaism, that is, mysticism in the form of the oriental mystery cults (p. 216f). It is evident that he has not taken into account Goodenough's recent researches in Philo. Again on p. 255 the cultural antecedents of the Hebrew settlers seem to be traced in a straight line from Mesopotamia without any recognition of the Exodus or of the work of Moses. Moreover, we wonder if the statement on

p. 273—describing the growth of a sharply nationalistic and exclusive point of view in first century Judaism—is not somewhat exaggerated. It scarcely tallies with Loewe's essay on Pharisaism in the middle of this volume, nor with the research of such scholars as Klausner. For my part I believe that nationalism did undergo a sharp development, but that it came later, viz. between the fall of Jerusalem in 70 and the revolt of Barkochba in the days of Hadrian. In the period before the fall of the second temple, Judaism was still a missionary religion; and although the two are not one hundred per cent mutually exclusive, still extreme nationalism does not thrive in the atmosphere of a missionary propaganda 'compassing sea and land to make one proselyte.'

The second volume will deal with "The Contact of Pharisaism with Other Cultures," and we are promised a further essay by Professor Loewe on 'The Ideas of Pharisaism,' a chapter by Canon W. L. Knox on 'Pharisaism and Hellenism,' one by Dr James Parkes on 'Rome, Pagan and Christian,' one by Dr E. Rosenthal on 'Islam.' 'France in the Thirteenth Century' will be the subject of a chapter by L. Rabinowitz; 'The Feudal Period' will be dealt with by G. G. Coulton; 'Reformation and Renaissance' by A. C. Adcock, and the volume will close with an essay by H. F. Stewart on 'Casuistry—Jewish and Jesuit Dialectics.'

FREDERICK C. GRANT.

*Judaism and Christianity.* Vol. ii. *The Contact of Pharisaism with other Cultures.* Ed. by H. Loewe. London: Sheldon Press; New York: Macmillan, 1937, pp. xxii + 371. \$6.00.

In this volume, as in the first, the editor has a major essay on Pharisaism—this time upon its ideas, whose evolution is sketched from the Return from the Exile to the redaction of the Babylonian Talmud. The 'men of the great synagogue' are viewed as 'an informal group of scholars,' to whom the title was probably given by their successors and disciples rather than their contemporaries: they were 'the descendants of Ezra's scholars and the forerunners of the Pharisees, into whom they shade imperceptibly.' Pharisaism was therefore very old, in the first century, and not a modern movement within Judaism—in fact, its antecedents antedate the Maccabees; and their interests were wider than the practice of scribal rigorism (as some Christian authors have described them), including even the preservation of the sacred text (p. 9). They held a lofty conception of God, and took a rationalizing, non-literal view of miracles. It was they who implanted the belief in the future life—whatever its origin, which is not explained—so deeply in Jewish thought that it has been indispensable ever since. They rejected apocalypticism, and modified angelology, and tried to check the tendency to interpose mediators between God and man: some even grasped the principle of universalism, and rejected the particularism and nationalism which to a great extent, certainly, if not completely, characterized later Judaism. The main purpose of the Pharisaic movement was 'the promotion of social service and the stimulation of public and private worship' (p. 45).

Now all this is a very different Pharisaism than we are accustomed to, in works on Christianity and Judaism in the first century—and we hope it is authentic. For it does religion no credit, nor Christianity, nor Christ, to have it appear that all Pharisees of the first century were hypocrites, wolves in sheep's clothing,



mechanical or professional observers of Torah who ignored the weightier matters of the Law of God, justice, mercy, and loving-kindness. That some Pharisees were hypocrites, none will deny—so are some Christians, alas. But it does not seem likely that the whole movement was moribund and a sheer burden to the soul of Judaism in the first century: no religion is ever utterly corrupt; and it seems more likely that Jesus castigated a false type of Pharisee, and that the tradition of his words was altered to include all Pharisees. We should like to accept Mr Loewe's account; our only question is whether it is not a trifle too modernizing—and for answer this will require a careful *Nachprüfung* of his sources.

Canon W. L. Knox's brilliant essay, 'Pharisaism and Hellenism,' deserves similar careful study. It is largely devoted to Philo, and to mysticism—or the mysteries; it is all the stranger then that no mention is made of Professor Goodenough's claim to have discovered traces of a Jewish-Hellenistic mystery cult in Philo. There is a brilliant conjecture on page 92—the exegesis of the 'hand-maids' in Genesis reflects an effort to glorify Judah at the expense of the Samaritans. Every page of the essay, and indeed of the book, contains suggestions that will strike fire in the mind of the exegete and the historian.

Later chapters deal with Islam, with Jewish-Christian relations in later centuries, and—the final chapter—with casuistry: Jewish and Jesuit Dialectics.

FREDERICK C. GRANT.

*Judaism in the War of Ideas.* By Harry Joshua Stern. New York: Bloch Publishing Company, 1937, pp. viii + 150. \$1.50.

Published in commemoration of the author's tenth anniversary as spiritual head of Temple Emanu-El, Montreal, this volume contains selected addresses covering that period. Sample titles are "How Shall the Jew Face the World?," "Religion, Ethics, and Modern Life," "The Faith of a Liberal," "A Creed for Modern Youth."

Any criticism of this collection must begin with the clear understanding that this man is primarily, first and all the time a Jew. His heritage, the source of his strength, the environment and background of his life are all Jewish. He makes no concessions to Christians; apology has no place in his philosophy. His pride in being a Jew colors every phrase that he utters.

Furthermore, this collection of addresses is made up, with one or two exceptions only, of sermons delivered to his own congregation. It is *not* meant for Christian consumption. They are emphatically not the product of a "Christian Rabbi."

All that being understood, it does not seem too much to say that every student of contemporary social development, of religion as such, of political philosophy might well read its all too few pages. Here the Jew speaks from his heart to other Jews. Here the whole strength of Judaism through the ages stands revealed in this son of modern times.

The salvation of his people, says Rabbi Stern, requires two things: one, a reasserting of the old spiritual values and idealism of traditional Judaism; and, second, a whole-hearted embracing of true liberalism. In the one, says the author, lies the Jew's only hope of survival; in the other his only hope for development.



The essay, "Evolution and the Bible," might well serve as required reading for every student of the Old Testament. The Bible is inspired—there is no question of that—but its inspiration is through men and as such has human weaknesses. Difficulties arise through "dogmas . . . respecting the Bible." "The Bible is not a textbook for every scientific domain."

As to the style of the work, let this quotation serve not only as a sample of the English employed but also as an indication of the author's underlying philosophy:

"Jewish prophets called for a religious order in the face of torture and persecution. Prophetic souls in Israel today must be in the vanguard pleading for a moral society as never before. . . . A form of life must ultimately be found that will give security to men and make human brotherhood possible. Our present system will perhaps find a way whereby the maximum income of men will be limited and a minimum wage will be guaranteed, thus removing the fear of economic uncertainty and giving men the opportunity to live in neighborliness and fraternity."

ALLEN D. ALBERT, JR.

*The Peril of Modernizing Jesus.* By Henry J. Cadbury. Macmillan, 1937, pp. vi + 216. \$2.00.

While within the past generation the old-fashioned devotional "Lives of Christ" have been less frequently written, they have been replaced by a constantly increasing flood of books by specialists in other fields than historical theology. When a scholar has attained competence in (say) sociology, economics, ethics, pedagogy, psychology in general or religious psychology in particular, he often feels that he has thus attained the key to the "Jesus problem" and sets forth his conclusions in print. While, no doubt, real help has been gained from some of these efforts, they are often futile in the extreme; and Dr Cadbury has undertaken the rather depressing task of exposing this futility; of pointing out that some acquaintance with historical method is desirable before undertaking a piece of historic research.

He begins with the wild blunders that have been made in purely external matters, passes to ignorance of the Jewish environment and thought-world, and then dwells at some length on that most perverse and troublesome of modernizations, the "social message." Finally he takes up the more subtle dangers of assuming that Jesus taught a system of ethics formalized by logical centralization, or that his "religious experience" can be classified with the types listed in modern case-books. Even New Testament specialists will use Dr Cadbury's book with profit, as he reveals perilous assumptions which even careful historians may make unwittingly. But for every clergyman and—above all!—for everyone planning to write about Jesus the book should be "required reading" without exception. If publishers on receipt of a manuscript should require assurance that Dr Cadbury's arguments have been carefully weighed, the level of future volumes would be raised amazingly.

There are, however, a few matters of details that may be queried. Despite what Dr Cadbury says (pp. 164, 181) Jesus rejected fasting after the ministry began; at least for himself and his disciples. The words "Love your enemies . . . that ye may be sons of your Father" certainly make love to men an attribute of

God (p. 150). Does not Luke xii.13-15 work very definitely from "an independent principle to its concrete application" (p. 168)? On page 188 Dr Cadbury does not distinguish sharply enough between a "new definition" and a definition new to Jesus' contemporaries. It is quite true that "evil eye" among the Jews might mean "covetousness" (p. 54) but this force is meaningless in Luke xi. 33-36. Despite all that has been said—not only by Dr Cadbury (p. 79) but by other scholars as well—the natural sense of Mark i.38 is a desire to avoid working cures; what has obscured this is a modernization that makes the Evangelists equate exorcism with healing the sick. And in estimating Jesus' relation to the current Judaism we must always remember Wellhausen's caustic, "Yes, but think how much else there is in the Talmud!"

BURTON SCOTT EASTON.

*The Mission and Message of Jesus.* An Exposition of the Gospels in the Light of Modern Research. By H. D. A. Major, T. W. Manson, and S. J. Wright. New York: Dutton, 1938, pp. xxxi + 966 + 1 map. \$5.00.

This is a really great book on the Gospels, one that scholars will find useful, since it is quite thoroughly up to date and takes into account current problems; and it is one that will be widely useful to students, since it is written in a clear, crisp style and with great objectivity, and succeeds in keeping in sight the needs and interests of contemporary religion. It is full of allusions to English literature, and the authors seem to be continuously aware that the New Testament is primarily a book of religion. To put it briefly, here is no dry-as-dust commentary but a vital exposition of the Gospels from a modern point of view, envisaging current problems and with the modern Church and the modern world steadily in mind.

It is true there are some positions represented—which is only to be expected in a composite work—which 'date' from a little earlier in this present generation; though on the whole the writers are abreast of current research in such fields as Form Criticism, Text Criticism, and Social Interpretation.

The arrangement of the book is simple and clear. Dr Major writes the introduction on 'The Four Gospels in the Light of Modern Research' and on the question, 'Are the Gospels True History?' Then follows the commentary, based upon the R. V. Book I by Dr Major is on 'Incidents in the Life of Jesus,' using St Mark and supplementing it with incidents from Matthew and Luke. Book II, on 'The Sayings of Jesus,' is by Dr Manson. The Document 'Q' provides the main contents of this book and it is supplemented by the peculiar matter in Matthew and Luke. Book III is on 'Jesus: The Revelation of God,' and is by Dr Wright. There is a good introduction on 'The Author, Purpose and Meaning of the Fourth Gospel' (pp. 643-704, with a good discussion of the main themes of the book) and then the Commentary on John. There is a fairly good bibliography, though it is very brief, and an Index of Scriptural References, and a very simple sketch map of Palestine.

The whole point of view of the work is liberal (see pp. xxv and xxix) but it is not a liberalism which has reduced or done away with the Christian faith; and it is a book that students of all schools will have to take into account. Incidentally

there is a good introduction to Form Criticism on pp. xx-xxii—and an even better one on pp. 320-327.

As a sample of the point of view in interpreting our Lord's message one may take the following:

"It should thus be apparent that the teaching of Jesus has to do not with the rightness of actions and motives or with the academic discussion of the *summum bonum*, but with the achievement of good living. This means the identification of human wills with the will of God so that one's life becomes part and parcel of the purpose of God in the world. Such life is as difficult and arduous as the composition of a Beethoven symphony is difficult, even for a Beethoven, and as spontaneous and inevitable. We cannot legislate in advance for such life: it creates its own rules in the light of the unfolding purpose of God. Nor can we judge it, for the only final criterion is the whole purpose of God, which is known to God alone. Such life is inspired, creative, adventurous. It is movement towards a goal: and for the purposes of that pilgrimage the teaching of Jesus is a compass rather than an ordnance map. He who grasps it in its wholeness and simplicity is sure of his direction: he must pick his own steps" (p. 329).

This is a book which can be heartily recommended to students and all interested persons, Church School teachers, clergy, laymen interested in the study of the Bible from the modern point of view—in fact all persons who are faced with the problems growing out of our historical and literary approach to the Bible and the beginnings of Christianity. It is just the kind of book that a friend of mine—one of the best teachers of New Testament in this country—told me five years ago he felt someone ought to write. I have been in complete agreement with him—and now I think we have the book we have been waiting for. It is popular without being superficial and sketchy, and it is scholarly without being dry and tiresome. All three of the authors know how to write English, and they evidently know how to teach New Testament, as well as being real scholars who approach the sacred literature at first-hand. The allusions to English and other literature, on page after page, add greatly to the appeal of the work.

FREDERICK C. GRANT.

*The New Testament.* A new translation from the original Greek. By F. A. Spencer. Ed. by Charles J. Callan and John A. McHugh. Macmillan, 1937, pp. xiv + 717 + 2 maps. \$4.50.

Father Spencer's translation of the Gospels, 'A New Translation from the Greek Text direct with reference to the Vulgate and the Ancient Syriac Version,' was published in 1901. The translator did not live to see the publication of his translation of the rest of the New Testament, though he spent the remainder of his life in the undertaking, "going over it with greatest care and attention many times, and putting his final touches on the translation and the notes only a month or two before he died." Unfortunately no one among the scholars of his Order was able to bring the book through a final editing and up to the point of publication. However, when the Bishops of the Roman Church met in Washington for their annual Convention in 1935, and there decided that a new English translation or revision of the New Testament should be prepared and published for use in this country, interest was again revived in the work done by Father Spencer. The Dominicans then went ahead and collated the manuscript copies of Spencer's

translation, and after this work was done by the present editors the manuscript was sent to Rome for the approval of the Dominican Master General. He appointed two Roman scholars, Father Vosté and Father Garde, to be the special revisors, and they went over the manuscript twice, comparing it word for word with both the Greek and the Latin Vulgate.

It is impossible to say at every point just where Spencer breaks off and his editors begin; but there is no question that the work will be known as Spencer's translation, and that it will be influential for a long time to come. It is certainly superior to the Douay version; but it stops short of full modernization. Textual questions are not discussed, the notes being designed for the ordinary reader; but each book is provided with a brief introduction of its own. Paragraph titles are used, and cross references, both of which will be useful to the serious lay student of the New Testament.

The text presupposed is evidently the current one—the general average of Westcott-Hort, Tischendorf, Nestle, Vogels, etc. with close attention to the Vulgate. The opening verses of St Mark offer a good sample:

"Beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, Son of God.

As it is written in Isaiah the prophet—

'Behold, I send My messenger before Thy face,

Who shall prepare the road for Thee;

A Voice of One crying in the desert:

"Prepare the road for the Lord,

Make His paths straight"—

John appeared, who baptized in the desert, and preached a baptism of penance for remission of sins. And all the country of Judea, and all the inhabitants of Jerusalem were going out to him, and were being baptized by him in the river Jordan, confessing their sins.

"And John was clothed in camel's hair, with a leather belt about his waist; and he lived upon locusts and wild honey. And he preached, saying, 'There is coming after me One mightier than I, whose sandal-strap I am not worthy to stoop down and untie. I baptize you with water; but He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost.'"

Here we note in vs. 1 the absence of the article, and the use of the verse as a title, and also the agreement with the English version—including the words 'Son of God.' In vs. 2, "Who shall prepare the road for Thee" is certainly euphonious, though the English version, "Who shall prepare Thy way before Thee," is in greater literal accord with the Vulgate. "Prepare the road for the Lord," is certainly better than the wholly unnecessary alteration in the English Revised, "Make ye ready"; moreover it is closer to the original.

Verse four still suffers from the same impossible construction which is found in both A.V. and R. V. "John . . . baptized in the desert, and preached a baptism. . . ." It might be thought that no human being would state John's mission in that order, and in fact the Greek reads "came [or was] John the baptizer in the desert." Father Spencer's rendering, "appeared," *points* in the right direction—we had already adopted it in a private translation of our own.

"Penance" of course looks in the direction of traditional Roman doctrine and terminology. "Country" looks like an unnecessary conformation to the R.V.,

while "were going out" is equally unnecessary literalism, as is also "were being baptized."

There are passages where the rhythm is exceedingly good and almost on a par with the A.V.; there are other passages where the rhythm seems to be completely forgotten. Of course the Roman Church does not have to face the problem of a translation for use in the public reading of the Services, as do the Protestant Churches and chiefly of course the Episcopal Church, with its enormous amount of Bible reading in lessons. For us the public readableness of a passage is a matter of great concern. This explains the preference of perhaps a majority of our people for the Authorized Version, which is simply unsurpassable for literary beauty. It accounts for the slight use of the Revised Version in the services of many of our churches, both here and in England. And also for our interest in a further revision of the Authorized Version rather than an adaptation of the Revised.

The freshness and suggestiveness of the translation are apparent on many a page. For example Luke 16: 19 "There was once a certain rich man"; Luke 17: 11 "Once while on a journey to Jerusalem"; 18: 1 "He also told them a parable, to the effect that they ought to pray at all times and not grow faint-hearted. 'There was a judge,' said he, 'in a certain town, who neither feared God nor had regard for man.'" . . . Even a form critic will take comfort from this translation, which brings out the story-element in the tradition so clearly and so appealingly.

FREDERICK C. GRANT.

*Das Neue Testament und Psalmen* . . . [Luther's Tr.]. Newly edited by the German Evangelical Bible Societies. Stuttgart: Priv. Württ. Bibelanstalt, 1938, pp. iv + 575 + 190 + viii. M 1.20.

After years of patient and devoted toil, the Revision Commission of the German Evangelical Bible Societies—appointed in 1921—has issued this 'trial edition' of New Testament and Psalms, and awaits the verdict of the Church. Theirs has been no easy task—to retain the manner, and the flavor, of Luther's classic translation, and yet take into account both modern ways of speech and also modern textual research: the task is similar to the one laid upon the new Revision Committee here in America by the International Religious Education Association. That the old flavor has been retained is evident from many a passage—e.g. Luther's famous translation of Psalm 73: 25, which Harnack quoted so impressively in his lectures on the Nature of Christianity:

Wenn ich nur dich habe,  
so frage ich nichts nach Himmel und Erde.

Even a string of sibilants like 'so sei sie' (Rom. 12: 7) is let stand—though it may not fall upon German ears as it does upon those of *Ausländer*. Or Luke 1: 34, where Mary says to the angel, 'sintemal ich von keinem Manne weiss'—as if she were the cloistered nun of mediaeval legend. On the contrary, Acts 3: 6 'in Namen Jesu Christi von Nazareth' becomes ' . . . des Nazoräers'—which may be questionable, in view of the use of the term for an early sect (in Epiphanius). Spelling has been modernized repeatedly, and the old declension of certain proper names (not of all) has been abandoned in accordance with modern German usage.



A fair sample of the revision may be seen in the following, from Mark 8 (revisions in parenthesis):

Zu der Zeit, da (wieder) viel Volks da war, (om.,) und hatten nichts zu essen, rief Jesus seine Jünger zu sich, (om.,) und sprach zu ihnen: Mich jammert des Volks; denn sie haben nun drei Tage bei mir verharret, (beharret; om.,) und haben nichts zu essen; und wenn ich sie ungesessen von mir heim liesse gehen (ungeessen liesse heimgehen), würden sie auf dem Wege verschmachten; denn etliche waren (sind) von ferne kommen (gekommen) . . . Woher nehmen wir Brot hie (hier) in der Wüsten (Wüste) . . . Und ihrer waren bei viertausend, die da gessen hatten (om. die . . . hatten); und er liess sie von sich. Und alsbald trat er in ein (das) Schiff mit seinen Jüngern, (om.,) und kam in die Gegend Dalmanuthas (Dalmanutha, which = Luther's original reading!).

The grounds upon which additions, omissions, or alterations are made will be obvious at once to most readers familiar with the Greek text and its apparatus of variants. The edition used is that of Nestle, which underlies this new German Revised Version much as Westcott-Hort underlies the E.R.V. Nestle is not always followed; but neither is Westcott-Hort in the English.

It is a *moderate* revision, not as literal as the R.V.; and it preserves in greater measure the classic diction and style of Luther than the R.V. preserves those of the A.V. It comes at an opportune time, and may perhaps prove useful or suggestive to our new American Revision Committee. In one respect, certainly, the Germans have the advantage—Luther is not relatively so archaic as is the A.V. 'Thee' and 'thou,' 'unto,' 'saith,' 'whosoever'—the relative archaism of the Jacobean revision is much greater than Luther's occasional 'hie' or his full genitives. Moreover, slight revisions have been made from time to time since the 17th century—not all at once in the 1870's. In a word, the present American revisers of the R.V. have a harder task before them than the Germans have had; but even so, the example of the German Evangelical Commission is most salutary, and they deserve the congratulations of Biblical students and scholars in all churches.

An added advantage of this edition is the lectionary at the end, giving (as in most German Bibles) the Epistles, Gospels, and Lessons for the Sundays and Holy Days of the Christian Year (as determined by the Eisenach Church Conference in 1896). Like everything the Württemberg Bible Society puts out, the book is a marvel of perfect composition, perfect press-work and binding, and perfect price!

FREDERICK C. GRANT.

*Civitas Dei.* By Lionel Curtis. Macmillan. Vol. i, 1934, pp. xxiii + 297. \$4.25. Vol. ii, 1937, pp. xliii + 557. \$3.00. Vol. iii, 1937, pp. xi + 131. \$1.75.

The fundamental thesis of this huge work is that the Gospel is the doctrine, or proclamation, of a *Commonwealth* of mankind upon this earth. The author is a man of affairs, widely experienced in India and South Africa. He has written upon such subjects as the principle of dyarchy applied to the government of India, the Chinese question, and the prevention of war; and he is deeply concerned with the application of Christian principles to world-politics. He believes that



the proper application of our Lord's teaching is not via ecclesiasticism—for the church at too early a date, and for too long since, has substituted the old principle of authority for the 'freedom of the Gospel' proclaimed by Jesus, who set each man at liberty to do his duty to his neighbor; rather, the proper application of the Gospel lies in a return to its fundamental and original concept of the Commonwealth of God (rather than 'Kingdom,' which is a mistranslation: see i. 166); and in the second place he believes this to be the only adequate solution of the chaotic confusion into which the whole world has fallen at the present day. As initial steps toward the setting-up of such a commonwealth he hopes to see groups of free nations federating here and there, e.g. the English-speaking nations, following which a federation of the whole world may eventually be achieved.

Volume i was published in 1934, as a work complete in itself. It goes back to prehistory, and traces the genesis of the State, chiefly in Israel and in Greece, and the destinies that overtook both forms of government; it sketches the contrast between the two principles of Commonwealth and Monarchy, and sets our Lord's life and message against the background of affairs in the first century. Later chapters trace the commonwealth idea down to modern times. Like the old prophets, who were 'primarily interested in the future of Israel in this world' (p. 106), 'the founder of Christianity was trying to divert the attention of his countrymen from violent or visionary projects to realities as he saw them. To him the final reality was the spirit of goodness personified—God, conceived as a Father possessed with desire to perfect the children he had made in his likeness and not as a despot absorbed in the thought of his own glory and power' (i. 281). Jesus was supremely a realist. Unlike the conventional pictures of his background, the Galilee of Jesus' day was seething with unrest: 'from the rising of Judas to the fall of Jerusalem the valleys where [he] spent his youth were a furnace of revolution' (i. 135). 'The Christian era began in a country where civilizations in conflict were preparing the stage for a great catastrophe' (i. 281). As contrasted with the Zealots, whose whole attitude and program he repudiated, Jesus' plan was that of peaceful self-government, through the development in men of a capacity to put the welfare of the whole group, the whole world, above their selfish private or national aims; it depended upon the cultivation of the instinct of men, 'weaker in some, but stronger in others, which enables them to put the public interest before their own' (i. 279). What the author finds in the Gospels is "the first beginnings in the Christian era of the process whereby that creative and potent idea, the Kingdom of God, as viewed and expounded by Jesus of Nazareth, is destined to be realized. I believe that the process here begun will still be continued, till the rule of law produced from the mind and conscience of those who obey it will not be limited to the national state, when nations, conscious of their own distinctive histories and structures, will have learned to function as organs of one international commonwealth. I do not believe that the still small voice which was first overheard in the cities of Greece and was raised to the sound of a trumpet in England will be silenced till all men have heard it and learned to obey one paramount law, based on the mind and conscience of all" (i. 280). This idea was all but stifled in the 'transcendental' theology of Paul, Augustine, and other Christian thinkers, for whom (e.g. for Augustine) politics was only the sordid business of managing a corrupt, degenerate, and perishing human society. But in spite

of all this, Jesus' idea persisted, and is still recognizable in the basic conception of the British commonwealth of nations.

Many readers will question the author's theology, and his exegesis; and, for example, his interpretation of the origin of the Resurrection story. But this should not blind us to the fact that one fundamental element in our Lord's teaching, certainly so far as it applies at all to conditions in the actual world, is clearly and powerfully set forth in this book. In *form*, it was an eschatological Gospel which Jesus taught; essentially, it was the truth about God and Man; and so far as this truth applies to politics, the *principles* of the Gospel, we believe, point toward a Kingdom of God to be realized upon this earth, rather than to a condition to obtain only in the transcendental Hereafter. That is the mainspring of the whole Christian social hope.

Vol. i was complete in itself; but out of discussions with friends emerged Vol. iii, on the application of the principles expounded in the original volume. Vol. iii was set up, printed and interleaved copies circulated among these friends. While they read and commented, the author wrote Vol. ii, on the present situation as the result of forces at work in the past. It is a huge panoramic sketch of the evolution of modern history, from Henry the Navigator to the Japanese army at Shanghai. It is no use trying to understand the present without regard to the past, let alone trying to shape the future on the basis solely of the contemporary situation. In this volume, once more, the author displays a marvellous range of knowledge, and a sure grasp upon the *Leitmotive*s of world-history. He is a thorough-going British realist, even to the extent of recognizing the fearful blunder of the Foreign Office in 1932, when Mr Stimson's proposal to check the Japanese in Manchuria was flatly rejected. Out of that has come—Ethiopia, Shanghai and Nanking, Madrid and Teruel, the new naval race, the new Berlin-Rome axis, and a coolness between Britain and America such as some of us have never witnessed before. These are very dark days indeed; but not utterly hopeless. For if we believe in God, and the Will of God as a real force in the universe, as the Hebrew prophets held and our Lord taught, in spite of all our blunders justice will be done in the end, and peace upon earth is still an achievable goal.

Vol. iii opens with a description of the confusion and frustration of the present: young men fear two things—unemployment, and war. From this the author goes on to recapitulate his diagnosis and prescription, and follows this with a personal confession of faith in the final reality of spirit as distinct from matter—in spirit and personality, which may be carried to the infinite degree of goodness and power, that is, God. If so, life has a meaning, and a realizable purpose upon earth. And though this be a day of small things, and the League of Nations a failure, there is hope of ultimate realization of the purpose of God—for it is the purpose of *God*. The Church can help on the realization if it will only begin by recognizing that our Lord was not describing a transcendental other-world, but a divine commonwealth of mankind to be achieved here within the boundaries of space and time.

Among other values this is a book full of information, suggestion, and stimulus for leaders of discussion-groups dealing with current world-affairs; and for tired idealists in the pulpit, who are tempted to feel that maybe, after all, the Gospel is too high and heroic for realization here on this 'lump of mud and wickedness,' and to wonder if not merely the downfall of democracy but total *Weltuntergang*

may be the fate in store for us. Of course democracy is no equivalent for the Kingdom of God; nor, perhaps, is an ideal commonwealth of nations—though there is more in it than most persons suspect, and we cannot dismiss this *element* in the Gospel with a wave of the hand. After all, though it may not be, as Mr Curtis thinks, the whole of the Gospel, it is certainly a vital and indispensable element in it.

FREDERICK C. GRANT.

*The Life and Letters of Bishop William White, Together with the Services and Addresses Commemorating the One Hundred Fiftieth Anniversary of His Consecration to the Episcopate.* Ed. by Walter Herbert Stowe. Church Historical Society Publication No. 9. Morehouse, 1937, pp. xiii + 306, illus.

As one of the foremost men in the history of the American Church, William White, the first Bishop of Pennsylvania, deserves the tribute of which this volume is another expression. The sesquicentennial of Bishop White's consecration to the episcopate (February 4th, 1787) was observed in Philadelphia and New York City; and the various addresses and papers presented at these commemorations are included in the book; there are also brief biographical sketches of Archbishop Moore and the English co-consecrators of Bishop White, letters written by the Bishop with annotations, and a good bibliography compiled by Doctor Chorley, the historiographer of the Church. Valuable as these items are, both as the record of the Church's reverence for the "saintly White, patriarch of a wide-spreading family," and as source-material, the importance of the consecutive biographical sketches must not be overlooked.

First, the almost forgotten account of William White's ancestry and early life, written by the late William Stevens Perry and published in serial form fifty years ago, has been reprinted; it constitutes the opening narrative. Bishop Perry has traced the forefathers of our great Presiding Bishop back to the middle of the fifteenth century, and has shown that a long line of sober and pious forbears preceded the removal to America. The early influences, the home environment, and the education of the future Bishop are described; and the account brings the reader to the young clergyman's stay in England, where he received ordination. "Mr White seems to have neglected no opportunity for improvement," says Bishop Perry, "especially in those matters pertaining to his sacred calling."

There follows a splendid study of White the Presbyterian, by the Rev. Mr Stowe, the editor of the volume. Many letters and contemporaneous documents are quoted; and a picture of the struggles of the Church during the Revolutionary War and the first years of independence is clearly drawn. Mr Stowe brings us to the most critical stage in the life of the American Church; the Anglican cause has suffered—it has become discredited and unpopular, the clergy are demoralised, the laymen are contemptuous, and there is neither linkage with the Mother Church nor organisation at home.

For such a crisis, statesmanship was needed. Doctor Louis C. Washburn, who for many years has lived in the most intimate relationship with the scenes and associations nearest Bishop White's heart, has furnished an article entitled "The Bishop"; and has shown how the progress of the Church in Pennsylvania was rendered possible by the sagacity and wisdom of William White. "After seven-

teen years of faithful and fruitful ministry as Deacon and Priest, he became for forty-nine yet more eventful years (sixty-six in all) the consecrated Father in God of our far-flung Communion in the rapidly developing new Nation. Through all this providentially prolonged period, he proved himself a growing soul, staunch and utterly true to the historic Faith; Anglican by the blood of generations and inherited convictions; a Catholic Christian, unwaveringly, in its unperturbed credal significance; glorying in the heritage of the English Reformation, declaring he would as lief be called a pagan as a partisan; and yet further, a daring Patriot, an American Churchman."

The Rev. William Wilson Manross has contributed a chapter on "Dr White's Episcopate," which is perhaps unsurpassed as an appraisal of the Bishop's influence and accomplishments in the higher calling. Many misconceptions regarding Bishop White's diplomatic relations should be cleared up by Mr Manross's succinct and scholarly treatment. It is bewildering to picture the variety and range of the Bishop's duties and responsibilities; he lived in a time when the institutions and activities of the Church were being launched, and for some of them he had no precedent or example. Mr Manross introduces us to the pioneer as he finds himself in a series of new situations; he does not retreat, however, and he is both industrious and far-sighted.

The fifth chapter of the book reminds us that William White was a notable teacher. Doctor James Alan Montgomery, a descendant of Bishop White, describes White as a leader in public and institutional education, as a founder of Church schools, as director of parochial education, as catechist, and as theological teacher. Among the younger men who learned of him we find John Henry Hobart and William Augustus Muhlenberg, as well as the great missionary to the West, Jackson Kemper. "The permanent worth of the teacher is revealed in his scholars. White founded no school of thought, but he educated his students to think for themselves."

The book is well printed and fully illustrated; it reflects credit on the editor, on the Church Historical Society, and on the loyal and devoted patrons who rendered the publication possible. We trust that it is the beginning of a series of much needed biographies, calculated to command the respect and attention of the scholar and secular historian and also to widen the general knowledge of our Church and its heroes.

EDGAR LEGARE PENNINGTON.

*Insurrection versus Resurrection.* By Maisie Ward. Sheed and Ward, 1937, pp. xi + 588. \$3.75.

Many of those who read *The Wilfrid Wards and the Transition* must have been looking forward to the appearance of the promised continuation of the story there told. Such anticipation is often doomed to disappointment, but the present work is an exception; the words with which the writer describes a book of her mother's are singularly applicable: "It is the work of a more practiced hand," though, unfortunately, it is not "a lighter touching on issues at least as deep" (p. 109). Generally there is less of the personal element which added interest to the earlier volume; we are left feeling that we would like to know more about the life of Wilfrid Ward and of Mrs Ward apart from its intellectual expression. But we

then ask for something which it was not the main purpose of the authoress to supply, for "the main theme of the book is the Modernist movement set against the Catholic Intellectual Revival" (p. v), and to depict the part which her parents played in that revival. Modernism is more or less constantly in the background, and in connection with it we would call attention to the splendid outline of the situation in the Roman Catholic world in the nineteenth century, deeply marked by a mental inertia out of which the "Insurrection" of Modernism grew. There was a fresh beginning of thought which, however misjudged and mistrusted by a lethargic Church at first, was a legitimate development and wholly orthodox, breathing new life into the bones—at least dormant, and culminating in "Catholic Action"; although in the course of the development of the movement there was the inevitable loss of individuals who could not, in faith, await the ultimate outcome. The changed situation is represented by two official utterances: "The Pastoral of 1900 forbade the excesses of Liberal Catholicism and demanded a submissive laity. The Pastoral of to-day asks for Catholic Action, and thereby demands an energetic laity" (p. 134). It would take more space to paraphrase than to quote a few passages, and would certainly be less satisfactory: "It would have profited little had we gained the whole world of Biblical science, historical criticism, triumphant scholarship, and lost revealed truth and supernatural life" (p. 540). "The positive has replaced the negative" (p. 542). "The dividing of the spoils after the defeat of Modernism consists of the utilisation of all that was really valuable in the thought of the Modernist period, but *which could not be used while it was part of a false system*" (p. 546). Some of the chapters, as that on The Irish University, will be of little interest to the general reader; but, in addition to those already mentioned, we would call especial attention to the discriminating study of Baron von Hügel. Finally, the book casts considerable light upon some points, good and otherwise, within the Roman Church, which are very apt to be overlooked by those who are not of that Communion; this, in itself, is no new thing, for it is clearly apparent in Wilfrid Ward's own *Newman*.

F. H. HALLOCK.

*Der Katholizismus: sein Stirb und Werde.* By Catholic theologians and laymen. Ed. by Gustav Mensching. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1937, pp. 247. RM. 4.50.

Although the German Catholics who have produced this volume disclaim the term *Modernist*, and rightly so if Modernism is what Pius X declared it to be, they are undoubtedly modernists in the wider meaning of the word. Repeatedly they quote with approval from Tyrrell and Schell, Modernists of a generation ago. Loyal sons of the Roman Church, they refuse to remain silent in the face of its shortcomings and its failure to measure up to the demands of our age. They criticize such a man as Karl Adam on the ground that he expounds an *ideal* Catholicism, with which *empirical* Catholicism is in glaring contrast, and in so doing chooses to ignore the contrast. More than once they summon Friedrich Heiler to the witness-stand for the prosecution.

Their indictment of the Roman doctrinal system claims that its biblical scholarship is precritical or uncritical, its apologetic outmoded, its historical assumptions often unscientific, its philosophical basis shackled to thirteenth century Thomism with an almost complete disdain of modern achievements in philosophy, psy-



chology, and ethics. It presupposes an intellectualism in religion which has long been discredited. It tends to identify dogma with faith. Its censorship discourages creative thinking. In short, the Roman Church is in danger of being stifled by the dead-weight of traditionalism, strangled by the iron hand of authority. It may have to die as it now is in order that it may live again free to accomplish its divine mission in the modern world.

But the book does not stop with destructive criticism. Upon the first part (*Abbau*) follows a second (*Aufbau*), in which the attempt is bravely made to separate the precious from the vile, to discover the permanently valuable religious elements underlying dogma. If the tendency of Protestantism has been to throw out the child with the bath, Catholicism in its Roman form tends to lose the child in the bath. While the two historic manifestations of Christianity in the West show little prospect of assimilation, each can and should learn from the other and correct itself by the other. The result: evangelical Catholicism (or Catholic Evangelicalism)—the Church the correlative of the Gospel.

But modernization of doctrine is not in itself enough. A program of practical reform is enunciated: vernacular in the liturgy, greater emphasis on preaching, Bible study in church and home, emancipation of the laity from clerical domination and a larger participation of the laity in the Church's work, abandonment of compulsory celibacy of the clergy.

The work is at once a courageous grappling with what are felt to be paralyzing inadequacies in the Roman system and a fine-spirited contribution to ecumenical Christianity. If the authors cloak their identity behind the mantle of anonymity it is not, they say, because they are afraid to be known, but because they wish their case to be judged solely on its own merits, not by the prestige of names. The editor is a Protestant, who took over the responsibility upon Rudolf Otto's death.

P. V. NORWOOD.

*The Unity of Philosophical Experience.* By Etienne Gilson. Scribner, 1937, pp. xii + 331. \$2.75.

Gilson, in this his latest book, doubtless offers Dean Inge added reason for the opinion expressed in the introduction to his recent *A Rustic Moralist*, that "Christianity, which is not hospitable to every philosophy . . . has, as I am increasingly convinced, a philosophy of its own. This I find most lucidly expounded in the Roman Catholic Neo-Thomists, such as Gilson and Maritain in France;" and again, "I think there are signs of a return to what Catholics call 'the perennial philosophy.'"

Coming as it does within a year of the publication of the *Spirit of Mediaeval Philosophy* (Gifford Lectures of 1931-1932), these twelve chapters were lectures recently delivered at Harvard University, and give further proof that Neo-Thomism is increasingly drawing to itself the attention of "secular philosophers." On all hands one catches overtones of curiosity and surprised admiration for the work of Gilson and the other "modern Schoolmen."

The book is a survey of the history of philosophy (with special emphasis on its development from Maimonides to the present) in which the author indicates what he believes to be a continuum in the process of human thinking bearing witness to an underlying organic determinism.



His own words best present the thesis: "It seems therefore, that though philosophic ideas can never be separate from philosophers and philosophies, they are, to some extent, independent of philosophers as well as of their philosophies" (p. 302). "If this be true, the constant recurrence of definite philosophical attitudes should suggest to the mind of its observers the presence of an abstract philosophical necessity" (p. 304) and "history contains a metaphysical determinism" (p. 305).

Gilson's own recapitulation demonstrates further what he means: "The reality of the facts seems to be beyond question. Plato's idealism comes first; Aristotle warns everybody that Platonism is heading for scepticism; then Greek scepticism arises, more or less redeemed by the moralism of the Stoics and Epicureans, or by the mysticism of Plotinus. St Thomas Aquinas restores philosophical knowledge, but Ockham cut its very root, and ushers in the late mediaeval and Renaissance scepticism, itself redeemed by the moralism of the Humanists or by the pseudo-mysticism of Nicolaus Cusanus and of his successors. Then come DesCartes and Locke, but their philosophies disintegrate into Berkeley and Hume, with the moralism of Rousseau and the visions of Swedenborg as natural reactions. Kant had read Swedenborg, Rousseau and Hume, but his own philosophical restoration ultimately degenerated into the various forms of contemporary agnosticism, with all sorts of moralisms and of would-be mysticisms as ready shelters against spiritual despair. The so-called death of philosophy being regularly attended by its revival, some new dogmatism should be now at hand. In short, the first law to be inferred from the philosophical experience is: Philosophy always buries its undertakers." The second: "by his very nature, man is a metaphysical animal." The third: "metaphysics is the knowledge gathered by a naturally transcendent reason in its search for first principles, or first causes, of what is given in sensible experience." "And this must be our fourth conclusion: as metaphysics aims at transcending all particular knowledge, no particular science is competent either to solve metaphysical problems, or to judge metaphysical solutions" (pp. 306-310). And the heart of the thesis of Gilson is that "Far from being a science long since exhausted, metaphysics is a science which has, as yet, been tried by few. What passed by its name was almost always something else . . ." (p. 318).

The author, in criticising what he considers the perversions of the various intellectual and scientific disciplines, is apt in coining for pseudo-logic, "logicism;" theology, "theologism;" sociology, "sociolatry;" physics, "physicism," and so on.

Such a volume is ample evidence that at least this Neo-Thomist is no "head-in-the sand" philosophical romantic . . . but one who is on easy terms with contemporary as well as historical movements. His is an admirable "synopticism" (what else can one say?) which bids fair to courteous reception by all schools of philosophical bias save that of the Neo-Positivists; for metaphysics here smiles unashamed.

F. H. O. BOWMAN.

*Beiträge zur Religionsphilosophie.* By Arthur Titius. Aus dem Nachlass herausgegeben von Marie Horstmeier. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1937, pp. 213. M. 4. 80.

When Arthur Titius fell ill in February, 1935, he was working on what was planned to be a comprehensive work in philosophy of religion. At the time of his

death, September 7, 1936, he had completed only the somewhat isolated writings comprising the chapters of this book. His unpublished material was turned over to one of his former students, Marie Horstmeier, who selected and arranged the material for this volume. The material was in its early stages, and a number of years would probably be required to develop it in full.

The chapters deal in a sketchy way with a number of important problems, and at times the thought is very suggestive. Such topics as belief and knowledge, metaphysics, causality, the infinity of God, mysticism, the psychology and sociology of religion, the development of religion and various methods of research are discussed.

The general point of view of the author may be indicated by his distinction between philosophy and religion. Philosophy is autonomous thinking, dealing with immanent spiritual life. Religion is related to God's ordinances and works. Prophet and philosopher are mutually exclusive. One may partake of both, but one cannot be philosopher and prophet at the same time. One cannot be an autonomous thinker and commissioned by God at the same time. He who stands in spiritual relationship with God may stand in judgment over all things.

This sharp distinction between philosophy and religion is overcome by *religionsphilosophie*. While philosophy deals only with man and is conditioned by its human limitations, the philosophy of religion deals with the relationship of God to man. Philosophy of religion, then, is in a position to be critical of both philosophy and religion. It is the responsibility of philosophy of religion to attack all the pollutions contained in the historical dross which covers the practice and thought of religion, so that the essentially spiritual may be distinguished from the accretions due to various social, individual, and historical forces.

Philosophy of religion, then, has three distinct problems to solve: (1) criticism of philosophy; (2) critique of religion on the basis of autonomous spiritual life; and (3) the purging of all spiritual ideas of the purely human, in order to subject them to the Holy, and to use them as symbols and conveyors of eternal spirit.

These distinctions may prove helpful for those who are trying to discover the relations between these various fields. One may object to the sharp bifurcation of human and divine, for it may seem that the subjective certitude of the prophet is not to be judged by human methods; but this dualism is not so sharp as it seems, for philosophy of religion is also dependent upon human tools for its effectiveness.

RANDOLPH CRUMP MILLER.

*Revelation.* By Gustaf Aulén, Karl Barth, Sergius Bulgakoff, M. C. D'Arcy, T. S. Eliot, Walter M. Horton, William Temple. Ed. by John Baillie and Hugh Martin. Macmillan, 1937, pp. xxiv + 312. \$2.50.

A full length volume on Revelation—the theological question of the hour! And the work not of one thinker, however distinguished, but of the galaxy of stars listed above! Small wonder that the reviewer was excited when last August in one of the University Hostels of Edinburgh during the World Conference some one showed him this volume, and that since he has looked forward eagerly to its perusal.

What of the book in calm retrospect and analysis? Is it, as a whole, a contribution of singular importance to the subject? Does it register an advance in thinking through the nature and implications of the Christian Revelation?

The answer clearly is in the affirmative. The work is a symposium and therefore inevitably partakes of the liabilities as well as the assets of a multiple mental approach and contribution. But in this case, partly because of the nature of the subject under discussion and partly because of the distinction of the contributing essayists, the virtues of the symposium unquestionably and considerably outweigh its drawbacks. Every essay comes to grips with the subject, indicates a clear-cut point of view, and leaves the impression of hard thinking on the central issues. The result is a seven-fold illumination of a single landscape from various angles and with differing intensities of light. If this means inevitably some confusion and clash of perception as to some details, it yields nonetheless as a net result greater richness, inspiration, and actual knowledge.

Of the individual contributions that of the Archbishop of York presents little that will be new to those who are familiar with his recent writings, while to those who do not know them it can be recommended as a concise presentation of ideas elaborated in numerous works. The essay of Professor Karl Barth is the most powerful in the book, while that of Father Bulgakoff of the Russian Seminary in Paris is the most spacious and surprising. Father D'Arcy writes, as always, with great competence and versatility, expounding that *complexio oppositorum* which in this as in every area of thought characterises the position of Roman Catholicism. Professor Horton stands up well in the assembly and presents a piece of work which reflects credit on American theology. Interestingly from the standpoint of general analysis as distinct from special implications not emphasized in either case, his position seems very close to that of D'Arcy, whereas Temple and Bulgakoff exhibit an affinity in general outlook. Bishop Aulén's contribution is perhaps the most individual of all, next to Barth's, having a flavor and a feel all its own so far as the volume is concerned, though one suspects that some of the qualities manifest in it are typical of contemporary Swedish Lutheran theology. Finally, Mr T. S. Eliot's essay, though the least theological, is the most intriguing of all! It constitutes a prolegomenon as unique as it is admirable.

As to unity and consolidation of territory all our writers, I think, would agree with Eliot that 'the division between those who accept, and those who deny, Christian revelation' is 'the most profound division between human beings.' Certainly all stress the absolute uniqueness of the Christian revelation and identify this in its fulness with the Word made flesh in Jesus Christ. When however it comes to the fact and extent of revelation outside Christ, differences appear. At this point Barth stands to the extreme right. Next to him is D'Arcy, for whom revelation strictly speaking is the Gospel of Jesus Christ, though a natural knowledge of God is beyond question. Next comes Horton, who would add to special revelation general revelation and natural knowledge. At the centre with Horton is Aulén for whom 'Christian theology speaks of a "general" revelation in nature and history,' though such a conception is fraught with great risks. To the left are Temple and Bulgakoff. The former sticks to his thesis that 'all existence is a revelation of God,' while the latter makes a good deal of 'a natural revelation of God in His creation, in nature and in the human spirit.'

From this it is clear that two issues remain open: (a) the fact and extent of 'general' revelation, and (b) the distinction between natural knowledge of God and general revelation. In directing attention to these two problems and breaking

some ground along the route of a possible solution, the authors of *Revelation* render a distinct service. Even more important is the impressive united front which they present on the reality and nature of the Christian revelation.

CHARLES W. LOWRY JR.

*Wer ist Christus?* (Sammlung Gemeinverständlicher Vorträge, 183.) By Erich Seeberg. Tübingen: Mohr, 1937, pp. 58. R.M. 1.50.

This lecture reflects the theological and ecclesiastico-political crisis in Germany. The author fears that events may force a separation of Church and State, but pleads for a tolerance that might save the situation. The radical separation of *the world* and *God* in dialectical theology is heretical in tendency, for Christ was an historical reality. Furthermore, those who see God only in the history of the nation are worshipping an image, not the prototype. The Church should be able to contain both German and Confessional Christians if both will but hold fast the characteristically Christian doctrine that God became man in Christ. In the opinion of the author, the Christ of faith is the Jesus of history, not the product of either Pauline or primitive Christian thought.

S. MACLEAN GILMOUR.

*Types of Modern Theology.* By Hugh Ross Mackintosh. Scribner, 1937, pp. vii + 332. \$5.00.

In this very welcome book Dr Mackintosh has given us an interpretation and evaluation of the significant movements in Protestant theological thought from Schleiermacher to Barth. After an introductory chapter providing the necessary background for an approach to the modern problems, there follow two chapters on the Theology of Feeling, i.e. Schleiermacher's interpretation of religion and of Christianity. While acknowledging the original thought and creative genius of Schleiermacher, Dr Mackintosh makes it perfectly clear why we have now passed beyond the theology of "absolute dependence" in our consciousness of a need for a theology at once more human and more distinctively Christian, which shall include a more satisfactory treatment of sin and of the Person of Christ.

The fourth chapter treats of the Theology of Speculative Rationalism, represented by Hegel and his followers, especially Strauss and Feuerbach. The author displays little sympathy with the Hegelian method of "swallowing up all historical realities in a timeless Absolute," for "Absoluteness has no love for unique persons and, therefore, can give no true account of Jesus Christ."

The next chapter, dealing with the thought of Ritschl and his Theology of Moral Values, is brilliantly done. Dr Mackintosh feels that Ritschl failed to see, "or at least failed to insist, that while Christ the revealer of God, is indeed *in* history, He is not *of* history, and that for this very reason His being in history at all is a divine marvel."

Chapter six is a searching criticism of Ernst Troeltsch's historical relativism and its bearing on the finality and absoluteness of Christian revelation. Chapter seven on the Theology of Paradox, as presented by Søren Kierkegaard, will be greatly enjoyed by all those who share in the enthusiasm evoked by the renewed interest in the study of this mysterious Dane. Dr Mackintosh believes Kierkegaard to be a spiritual genius of solitary grandeur, a real prophet. Yet he intro-

duces "new distortions of belief so violent and perverse as gravely to imperil our hold on the New Testament conception of God and of the life His children are called to lead."

The final chapter, on the theology of Karl Barth, is one of the finest interpretations and criticisms of the great German theologian that we have seen. A reading of it will do much to remove many of the misconceptions regarding the Barthian theology. It is in Barth, moreover, that Dr Mackintosh finds the spirit with which he has most in common. He is perfectly aware of the often apparent one-sidedness of the German's distinctive emphases, and yet he feels that Barth has given us "the most serious theological effort of this generation, and the most vigorous Christian criticism of the assumptions and claims of naturalism." "The theology of Barth, criticize it as we may, is the Christian thinking of a great Christian mind, explosive and often unduly emphatic, but none the less of incalculable import for the Church of our time."

PAUL S. KRAMER.

*An Introduction to Logic.* By Jacques Maritain. Sheed and Ward, 1937, pp. x + 300. \$2.50.

The demand for a synthesis or unifying philosophy of modern culture is rippling out in wider circles from the stone cast by M. Gilson at the Harvard Tercentenary two years ago. Jacques Maritain, representing a group of French intellectuals who lead the post-War renaissance in Catholicism, is a world figure at this date, alert to the problems of contemporary thought and at the same time a great admirer of scholasticism. In a lecture in New York last winter (*Jacques Maritain*, Sheed and Ward) Dr Gerald B. Phelan argued with impressive force that progress in philosophy is in no way compromised by the conviction that its principles were definitively clarified by Thomas Aquinas centuries ago.

Maritain's *Introduction to Philosophy* was published several years ago, as the first installment of his projected re-statement of the Thomist system. He is *not* a Neo-scholastic, as many think; he firmly defends Thomist orthodoxy of the strict Dominican tradition. The present book is a translation of his *Petite Logique*, being a manual of instruction for beginners in the discipline of formal logic. Fashioned for the elementary student and not for experts, it entirely leaves aside controversial questions like those raised in the "symbolic logic" of Russell and Whitehead. Unlike most texts in this discipline, this one takes the pupil fully into its confidence by explaining throughout the reasons for its arrangement of its material. Incidentally, Maritain's division of the matter of formal logic differs from the normal medieval arrangement, but the author believes nevertheless that he remains "faithful to the spirit of Aristotle and the ancient scholastics."

In addition to the usual diagrams illustrating the figures and moods Maritain has devised some original charts to "visualize" other sections of the subject. Some are successful, like those in *cap.* III ("Reasoning"); some only make confusion the worse confounded for the beginner, like the chart on "Operations of the Mind" (pp. 6-7). Unfortunately, the book opens with an error (p. 2), in which the second example of judgment is said to deny the predicate term to the subject when in fact it affirms it. This must surely be an error in translation.

JOSEPH F. FLETCHER.



*The Parish Communion.* A book of essays, edited by A. G. Hebert. London: S.P.C.K.; New York: Macmillan, 1937, pp. xii + 311. \$2.75.

In his Preface Fr Hebert states it to be the purpose of these essays (and especially of the first group of them) to "set forth a conception of the nature of the Church which appears to compel the adoption of the Parish Communion as its necessary expression in liturgy". In the Eucharist, the Church, the Mystical Body, offers up the Sacramental Body of Christ, to receive it back as heavenly nourishment whereby the Mystical Body participates in the divine-human life of the Glorified Body. It is the *corpus mysticum* that offers, or the congregation as its local unit. This is presupposed in the New Testament doctrine of the Church and the Eucharist, as A. M. Ferrer points out. Further, as Fr Gregory Dix impressively shows, this conception finds ample expression in the primitive liturgies. But, unfortunately, the Eucharist has undergone a process of clericalization: the priest is thought of as *the* offerer of the sacrifice, the congregation merely "assisting" at Mass and receiving the Communion but rarely.

The problem is to undo the damage wrought through a thousand years prior to the Reformation, by which the Reformers were to a large degree misled. The like-minded group who have produced this volume find the solution of the problem in the Parish Communion. The serious difficulties raised mainly by the obligation to receive fasting (and the essayists seem to be a unit in regarding the obligation as at least morally binding in the Anglican Church) are discussed at some length in the latter part of the book. The essays deserve to be carefully weighed by all who would restore the Eucharist to its rightful place as the central act of Christian worship, the people participating actively and making their Communions with regularity. Even those who are not conscious of the practical difficulties here considered will find the book helpful and bracing in its insistence that the Eucharist is essentially a corporate oblation in which the laity have a positive share, although, unhappily, they have for some centuries been denied effective expression of their rights.

P. V. NORWOOD.

*Hymnody Past and Present.* By C. S. Phillips. Macmillan, 1937, pp. x + 301. \$3.60.

The author says that the main purpose of this book is to show how "Newman's dream for the Church of England almost a century ago has been in large measure fulfilled," the dream "of the gradual drifting of precious things upon her shores, now one and now another, out of which she may complete her rosary and enrich her beads." So he gives us a most interestingly written history of "those precious things"—the Hymns of the Christian Church.

Beginning with the Early Church this valuable volume traces the history and development of hymn-singing through the Eastern Church, the Latin Church, and the hymns of Lutheran Germany.

The singing of rhythmical prayers began in the first century, and hymns and anthems were used in the Early Church, but the popular singing of hymns was first used by such heretics as Arius for the propagating of their views among the masses and the Orthodox were forced to take them up to meet the challenge of the heretics.



The hymns so written gradually made their way into the Services of the Church and the author tells us of the great hymn-writers of the Greek and Latin Churches and of the individual hymns which age has produced and which are available for our own use today.

The author then tells the story of English Hymnody and the contribution made by Wesleyans and Evangelicals, and the Oxford Movement. The stories of the great English hymns are recalled until finally the Hymnals in use in the Church of England today are compiled.

The last two chapters contain valuable practical suggestions which any Rector and organist can read with great profit. We are told, "The vogue of the moment is an extremely unsafe guide. Time is a good critic and those hymns survive which deserve to survive". These are the hymns of which mention has been made in his book and of which he says that they have a good claim to inclusion in any Hymnal which represents the best. But he is very tender too in his treatment of hymns of less literary value and says that "in the great work of saving souls questions of artistic taste are of secondary importance."

So he divides hymns into two classes: Liturgical, those used for the adornment of worship, which should be the classical products of the ages, and Popular and Missionary—hymns adapted to the special needs of each generation. The Church of England has steadily declined to publish an "authorised Hymnal, the different schools of thought in the Church using hymn books which appeal especially to their theological views and taste in worship." We of the American Church, where divisions are happily not so marked, do have a Hymn Book authorised by General Convention.

The last General Convention appointed a Commission to revise the Hymnal, and this history of Hymnody will be specially valuable to all interested in that revision.

H. J. MIKELL.

*The Modern Family and the Church.* By Regina Westcott Wieman. Harper, 1937, pp. xii + 407.

The problem here considered is in what manner the churches may contribute to the conservation of the family: what influences they may bring to bear to promote happy marriages, how they may be of use in maintaining harmony and forestalling quarrels and divorces, what aid they can furnish to parents in the rearing and education of the children, wherein they can guide adolescents and youths toward useful lives and the establishment of successful families of their own. The viewpoint is that of the sociologist. Both Church and Family are evaluated purely as social institutions. No theological background is expressed; but the humanism set forth in the writings of the author's husband, Henry N. Wieman, is implied.

The family, the author points out, is a supremely important social institution and it is in grave danger. In former times, when it was the economic unit and to some extent the social and religious unit, the position of the family was secure. Now, when the unit is the individual, the maintenance of the family is no longer presupposed, it is become almost a voluntary group, and its preservation presents

a serious problem. No family is secure unless it involves a unity and community in which every member feels himself to be intimately related to the others and dependent upon the whole; and this unity can no longer grow of itself, but must be consciously, purposely, and earnestly built up by both parents and children. Toward this achievement no agency can contribute so much as the churches.

That the family, and not the individual standing alone, is the religious and social unit is a doctrine fundamental to Christianity. But of late the churches have largely ignored it in practice. One is glad that the truth of this doctrine is now confirmed from the viewpoint not of religion but of sociology. The churches, however, may well be ashamed that they should need to be reminded of their duty.

Out of her own wide experience as counselor of family relations, the author presents specific programs for churches in every phase of family life, programs for pastors, for groups of young married couples, for Sunday Schools, for adolescents' and young people's organizations, and for counsel and aid by individuals.

These programs constitute the most useful feature of the book. To be sure, no single church could put them all into effect—and do anything else whatever. Probably the author did not intend it. Each congregation would have to pick out and use such portions of the whole program as would supply its own need. So understood and used the book is exceedingly valuable.

Not the least interesting part is a symposium of the work for conservation of the family now actually in effect in various religious bodies, a representative of each body being allowed to tell its own story without comment by the author. Such specific reports cover Roman Catholics, non-Roman Christian Communions (treated together and reported by the Federal Council of Churches), Jews, Mormons, and Christian Scientists. The actual work which is now being done is paltry enough. Reading between the lines one gathers that in many religious bodies it exists entirely on paper.

It is a pity that the author in her recommendations for specific programs has taken no account of the point of view that both the Church and the Family are divine-human organisms, subsisting and finding their sanctions in a moral law that is higher than any statute or any social necessity—that they exist for themselves, to produce and train citizens for the Kingdom of Heaven. Programs based upon this underlying philosophy will differ in important respects from those recommended by the author; and they should be greatly more effectual. It is a pity, I say, that this viewpoint has been disregarded. While it may not be the philosophy of the author, it is that of an overwhelming majority of Christians. It cannot rightly be ignored in any study of the subject that lays claim to being objective.

CHARLES LEMUEL DIBBLE.

*Religion and Public Affairs: in Honor of Bishop Francis John McConnell.* By Harris Franklin Rall and others. Macmillan, 1937, pp. xii + 240. \$2.00.

These nine essays honor one of the leaders of American Protestantism for his long and fruitful ministry, particularly for his clear-headed and courageous thought and action in the field of social relations. The reader will do well if, after reading

the opening essay, biographical and appreciative, he turns to Prof. Brightman's account of Bishop McConnell's social philosophy, the seventh essay, before going on to the others. These take up various fields of his significant leadership—labor relations, civil liberties, social security, international relations, each written by a colleague in his work. Mr. Epstein's authoritative account of the present situation in this country in the matter of social security legislation is particularly useful; like the others, he is not merely interested in telling of the Bishop's work, but mainly in the present problem. Three other essays, dealing with East and West, The Public Mind, and Social Change, are quite general, and of less interest.

N. B. NASH.

## NOTES ON NEW BOOKS

### Biblical

*Biblia Hebraica*. Edited by Rudolf Kittel. 3d ed., prepared by P. Kahle (Massoretic Notes), A. Alt, and O. Eissfeldt (completed after the Editor's death). Stuttgart: Priv. Württemb. Bibelanstalt, 1937, pp. xi + 1434. M. 10.

Rudolf Kittel's great edition of the Hebrew Bible—to many of us the companion of our youth—was published at Leipzig in 1906. The new, third edition appeared in Stuttgart last autumn, thirty-one years later. Of the original assistant editors, Professors G. Beer and F. Buhl are the only ones whose names still adorn the title-page. The new names are those of W. Baumgartner, J. Begrich, J. A. Bewer, J. Hempel, F. Horst, M. Noth, O. Procksch, G. Quell, T. H. Robinson, W. Rudolph, and H. H. Schaefer. The Books of Ruth and Lamentations were edited by Professor Robinson of Cardiff, Ezekiel by Professor Bewer of Union Theological Seminary in New York, thus making the third edition international. The first installment (Genesis, if I recall correctly) appeared in 1929, and in that year Professor Kittel died. Thereupon the Württemberg Bible Society, which had undertaken the new edition, engaged Professors Alt and Eissfeldt to see the work through the press. Dr. Paul Kahle of Bonn had already undertaken responsibility for the Massoretic marginal notes, and he has carried these through to completion—though the Greater Massorah still remains to be printed, and will be distributed gratis to owners of the book sometime during the coming year.

Those who have examined earlier installments of the volume are aware of its advantages such as the larger page, larger, clearer type, and enlarged apparatus—there are in fact two, one giving simply variant readings of Mss and Vss, the other the really serious textual alterations, along with editorial notes and conjectures. Significant variants found in the Targum have been added by Dr. Alex. Sperber of Bonn. The result is a most imposing manual edition, with a colossal array of materials for the student to explore and use.

Even this, however, does not state the most important feature of the edition, which is its *text*. Most Hebrew Bibles, including the two earlier editions of Kittel, have printed the Massoretic text as it is found in Mss of the 13th and 14th centuries, i.e. the text of Ben Chayyim (printed by Bomberg in Venice, 1524-25); the new Kittel goes back to that of Ben Asher, some centuries earlier, as contained (chiefly) in the Leningrad manuscript, L. Unfortunately, the owners of the master codex, which is in the Sephardic Synagogue at Aleppo, refused all co-operation, and would not listen to proposals even to photograph it. However, Dr. Kahle has satisfied himself, upon the basis of Mischael b. Uzziel's list of differences between the texts of Ben Asher and Ben Naphtali, that the Ms L is a reliable copy of Ben Asher's text. This means that an even purer Massoretic text now lies before us than that of the Cairo Codex of the Prophets, which is dated in the year 895. It means also that the Massoretic notes appended to this

edition are more reliable than those which Jacob ben Chayyim compiled from various sources—we are about as close to the original work of the Massoretes as we shall ever get, at least until new Mss turn up. Since the readings of L are earlier than most of the later variants, it has not been deemed necessary to fill up the apparatus with these latter. Instead, all available material for *pre-Massoretic* readings has been collated. Short of a fresh discovery of older Mss in some still unopened Genizah in the East, like the one found in 1890 at Cairo by Schechter, we have here all the important variants that have survived the devastations of the centuries. It is not going beyond the facts to say that this is the finest Hebrew Bible ever published.

And the price!—ten marks, normally \$2.50, at present \$4.00. Surely students everywhere will rise up and bless the Bible Society that has made this edition possible.

F. C. G.

*The Biblical Text in the Making, A Study of the Kethib-Qere.* By Robert Gordis. Philadelphia: Dropsie College, 1937, pp. 219. \$2.50.

"In the printed Hebrew Bibles of today, a considerable number of words occur where the vowels do not correspond to the consonantal text. . . . The former word, the consonants of which are written, is termed the Kethib; the latter word, which is read, though not written, is termed the Qere."

In this work the author undertakes to trace the development of previous work on this difficult subject and sets up a series of classifications of his own. These are then used as outlines for the listing of all the occurrences in the Hebrew text, guides against blasphemy, obscenity, erroneous readings, and, most important of all, versal differences. These last, in turn, are classified as to grammatical forms.

For the scholar engaged in textual study this work would seem to be very nearly essential.

A. D. A. JR.

*The Bible and its Literary Associations.* By Margaret B. Crook and other members of the Faculty of Smith College. Abingdon Press, 1937, pp. 395. \$2.50.

An introduction to the Bible, tracing its evolution from the earliest beginnings of Old Testament literature, its slow growth and successive compilation, and describing its chief versions, ancient and modern (Septuagint, Vulgate, Anglo-Saxon, English, and German), and the influence of the English Bible upon subsequent literature. It stops with the A.V. From a *literary* point of view this was proper; but one questions if better evidence of the influence of the English Bible could not have been found than by concentrating upon Milton, Baxter, Bunyan, and Fox—though supplementary essays deal with the Scottish Psalter, English Biblical Drama, De Quincey, and Hardy. Of course, the influence of the Bible cannot be traced in detail in one volume; probably the better way is, as here, to choose examples; but one gains the impression that the English Bible is pretty much the property of 'Nonconformists,' as the Lutheran Bible belongs to Protestants. What about the Book of Common Prayer, whose history is closely entwined with that of the English Bible, and goes beyond the mere adoption of one or another translation for Psalter, Epistles and Gospels? One also wishes

that St Augustine had been cited for more than his theology; his polished golden prose, the rich music of his balanced periods, his very diction, echo the Latin Psalter which he knew by heart.

But it is ungracious to criticize as useful and valuable a text-book as this, with its wide range of material, clear arrangement and presentation, interesting style, good bibliographies, and guaranteed interest on the part of students! There is no excuse for superficial, homiletical courses in Bible at college, if teachers will only turn their students loose with books like this to guide them.

F. C. G.

*Hebrew Religion. Its Origin and Development.* By W. O. E. Oesterley and Theodore H. Robinson. Second edition. Macmillan, 1937, pp. xiii + 448. \$3.00.

The new edition of this very useful text-book is a considerable enlargement upon the first (37 additional pages, and closer set type). Much of it has been rewritten; Part I has been rearranged, Part II considerably expanded—especially on the After-Life, and there is a new chapter on the Messianic Hope.

In contrast with Ludwig Köhler, whose recent *Old Testament Theology* finds no Messiah in the Old Testament except, paradoxically, in the Suffering Servant of II Isaiah, Oesterley and Robinson find 'safe ground' as early as Isa. 32—the ideal king who shall be a refuge and a shelter for all who are in need—and in the later passage, in ch. II, where this ideal king 'shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, nor reprove after the hearing of his ears.' Though Isa. 9 may refer to some actual royal child, the description 'perhaps owes something to the older conceptions of popular and courtly Messianic theory.' But it is a century later before we find a Davidic ancestry imputed to this ideal figure of the future. By the close of the exile, the idea was current.

The authors are quite right in insisting (p. 382) that the Messianic conception was independent of eschatology, at least for many centuries. This was Klausner's point, in his *Messianic Concepts of the Jews during the Tannaite Period*—Klausner insisting that the distinction was always made, in normal Judaism. How eschatology and Messianism were combined in the Apocalypses is sketched very briefly in the remainder of the chapter. "From the first [the Messiah] had been an earthly monarch, and, in spite of his unique capacities and powers, he had never been accorded higher rank. For the age of the apocalyptic writers, the merely human and the merely earthly were inadequate. The world as they knew it had deteriorated past all healing. . . . The prospect of a redeemed Israel had vanished or sunk into the background, and their conception of the world to come was markedly individualistic. Losing all expectation of a restored Israel, they desired a better country, that is, a heavenly. In such a scheme the traditional figure of the Messiah could have no final place. . . . The utmost that even a son of David could do was in some measure to prepare the way for the eternal future. . . . It was left to Christian thought to accept, expand, and transfigure the hint dropped in the *Similitudes of Enoch*, and to transfer the Messiah from the realm of this life to that which is eternal in the heavens" (p. 385.)

F. C. G.



*Deuteronomy: With Commentary.* By Joseph Reider. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1937, pp. xlv + 355, with 3 maps. \$2.50.

Dr Reider explicitly rejects the source theory of the origin of the Pentateuch, and accepts, with some slight modifications, the tradition of Mosaic authorship. He claims to adduce evidence for the validity of this position. To this it need only be said that Dr Reider holds curious views as to what constitutes evidence. The commentary is interesting in its emphasis on the Jewish point of view and for its frequent reference to classical Jewish literature. Its explanatory notes are useful. As regards religion it is unfortunately lacking in depth and penetration.

C. A. S.

*Die Palästina-Literatur.* Ed. by Peter Thomsen. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1938, pp. 240.

This is fasciculus No. 3 of Volume V, covering the literature of 1925-1934. It completes the section on Archaeology, and also includes Geography and part of "Palestine today." About one more fasciculus will be issued. There are of course occasional misprints, such as "Miller Burrows" for "Millar Burrows," but that can hardly be avoided.

S. E. J.

*The Praises of Wisdom: Being Part I of the Book of Wisdom.* A Revised Translation with Notes by E. H. Blakeney. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1937, pp. x + 57. 7/6.

The Greek of the first nine chapters of Wisdom is printed with a translation on the opposite page; there is also a short introduction and a select glossary. The translation is based on that of the A. V. which is however much altered, usually for the better, though *frolics* of wild beasts is not an improvement on *furies* in 7:20. The translation is not always that of the Greek as printed on the opposite page, e.g. at 2:9 and 5:14. A negative is left out in 4:17, and wrath should be wealth in 7:8.

A. H. F.

*The Epistle to the Romans.* With Introduction and Commentary by K. E. Kirk. Oxford University Press, 1937, pp. 244. \$1.75.

A chapter on 'The Main Ideas of the Epistle' occupies 100 pages of the Introduction and is in itself a handbook of St Paul's theology. The Revised Version is printed with useful headlines over each section and a brief commentary completes the book. The editor is unusually frank in pointing out where some of St Paul's arguments and illustrations are forced and almost perverse, but he does not fail to show that underneath this occasionally queer dialectic there lies the most striking conception of religion that has ever been expressed.

A. H. F.

*Die Bildersprache des Apostels Paulus.* By Werner Straub. Tübingen: Mohr, 1937, pp. 183. RM. 7.80.

This important monograph makes a thorough study of St. Paul's figurative language; something often attempted for our Lord's sayings, but seldom for the Pauline epistles. The author classifies the material into pictorial words, pictorial expressions, similes, metaphors, figurative sayings and *Gleichnisse*. Among others there are chapters on form-criticism of Paul's figurative speech, the personality

of Paul in the light of his figurative language, and the significance of this language for the study of his theology.

This language includes both scholarly and popular elements. The *Gleichnisse*, like those of the diatribe, are neither parables nor rounded-out descriptions. In form his work occupies a middle position between Jewish and Greek tradition (pp. 112f). A study of St. Paul's language shows him to be relatively unconscious of his literary methods, so concentrated is he upon his message; he is no conscious artist (pp. 154-6). He is warm and emotional, a born fighter, a man with surpassing talent as an organizer, and is interested in legal matters (pp. 156-8).

Straub finds great difficulty in St. Paul's use of the metaphors "one Body," "Body of Christ," and "the Body" (thought of with Christ as its "Head"). Why should Paul speak of Christ as a *part* of the Body, even though he is that part which wields the dominating influence? A solution is sought by considering not only Ephesians but also Colossians as deutero-Pauline. Here and in his insistence that between the Body and Christ there is "no mystical union but the relationship of subjects ready for the service of their Lord" (p. 168) the author appears to be influenced by his own presuppositions. Why must it be thought that all genuine Pauline epistles should exhibit precisely the same theology and pictorial language?

S. E. J.

*The 'Western' Text of the Gospels.* By William Henry Paine Hatch. Evanston: Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, 1937, pp. 44. 50 cents.

This twenty-third annual Hale Sermon is not a sermon; it is rather a lecture in which Professor Hatch makes an important contribution to the understanding of the so-called western text. Starting from Dr Ropes' theory that the western text of Acts is a definite revision, Dr Hatch studies a number of selected readings, and comes to the conclusion that the same is true in the gospels. The revision took place between 125 and 140, possibly in Antioch. The evidence which is marshalled seems clearly to show that the peculiarities of the western text are not accidental.

S. E. J.

*Jewish Christianity.* By H. E. Dana. New Orleans: Bible Institute Memorial Press, 1937, pp. 287. \$1.50.

Under this title Professor Dana presents a brief commentary on Acts 1-12, James, I and II Peter, Jude and Hebrews. He ascribes more importance to Jewish Christianity than do most present-day critics, e.g. Kundsinn, and his viewpoint is diametrically opposed to that of Riddle. For him Acts 1-12 is all of a piece. Both the Petrine epistles may be apostolic, or may be considered so for practical purposes. The book is valuable for its emphasis on the importance of non-Pauline Christianity.

S. E. J.

*First-Century Christianity.* By J. W. C. Wand. Oxford University Press, 1937, pp. xii + 172. \$2.25.

The new Archbishop of Brisbane delivered these Moorhouse Lectures in the Melbourne cathedral in 1936. They form a book which is important because it shows an English scholar taking real cognizance of German and American N. T.

study and passing sensible judgment on it; because it gives a real, though all too brief, answer to the extremes of form-critical interpretation while accepting the method; and because it seeks to apply the latest results of N. T. study to the problems of reunion—which was one thing that the Edinburgh delegates, who were largely dogmatic theologians, failed to do.

Archbishop Wand reacts against the idea that Paul is in fact the founder of Christianity and that all books of the N. T. are deeply influenced by his thought (pp. 121ff). First Peter, e.g., represents normal Christianity as contrasted with the personal emphases of Paul, John and the author of Hebrews (p. 131). Christology is not the invention of the *Urgemeinde* but stems from our Lord's teaching about himself (pp. 12ff). He finds no dichotomy in the N. T. between baptism by water and by the Spirit (pp. 95f). He doubts the early existence of the Agape (p. 90). Bacon's interpretation of the Fourth Gospel as a series of festal miracles and discourses is followed (pp. 128f).

S. E. J.

*The Golden Chain.* Vol. I, Part I. By Solomon Goldman. New York: Bloch, 1937, pp. xi + 219. \$1.50.

The Rabbi of Anshe Emet in Chicago here presents the first half of the first volume of his series on Hebrew and Jewish literature. This volume covers the material in the Old Testament, Genesis through Kings. Chapters are broken up into a discussion of *Contents, Authorship* (the author thinks it "not rash" to attribute the Pentateuch to Moses), *Style and Philosophy, Influence*, and a list of familiar quotations.

A. D. A. JR.

#### Church History

*John Wesley in the Evolution of Protestantism.* By Maximin Piette. Sheed & Ward, 1937, pp. xlviii + 569. \$5.00.

It is strange but true that the best book on Wesley should be written by a Roman Catholic Priest—and a Belgian besides. "No work on Wesley," says the English historian, Dr H. B. Workman, himself a Methodist, "seems to me to combine in so eminent a degree insight and scholarship together with a certain critical faculty."

In 1913 Father Piette began his researches on Methodism and its founder John Wesley. The war ended, he was free to pursue this work, and in 1925 appeared this book, now translated for the first time, *John Wesley: Sa Réaction dans l'Évolution du Protestantisme*.

It met with immediate success, and the author was accorded the title of Doctor and Master of Theology by the University of Louvain. In 1926 the Belgian Government awarded this book first prize in the Inter-University awards. In 1927 it was crowned by the French Academy. Since that time the author has devoted much of his time to further researches on the Protestant Churches of the New World, especially those stemming from Wesley. Five years he had spent in English libraries preparing for his magnum opus. Later in 1927-29, and in 1936-37, he had visited the libraries of North America, visiting practically every state in the Union, taking thousands of photostatic copies of manuscript documents and discovering many original sources hitherto unsuspected by Methodists themselves. In 1928 he received a Master's Degree from Harvard.

The general divisions of this remarkable, painstaking work are three: The Evolution of Protestantism before the 18th Century, Protestantism in the 18th Century, John Wesley's Movement.

A full first half of the book is taken up with the first two subjects, providing a careful searching appraisal of Zwinglianism, Lutheranism, Calvinism, and the Anglican Reformation, and sketching in the dissident sects of the 18th century—Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists, Quakers, etc.

The second half is devoted to Wesley and Wesleyanism. The enormous bibliography of the subject chronologically arranged covers eighteen pages. The careful scholarship of the author is revealed in eighty-six pages of notes at the end of the volume. No index is provided, but none is really necessary since the analytical table of contents is very full and detailed.

Despite the translation the reader delights in the compact, vigorous, pointed style which reflects upon every page the complete mastery of material by the author. Moreover Father Piette conveys a spirit of obviously fair and generous understanding, while at the same time he leaves no one in doubt as to his own solid convictions as a Roman Catholic.

This is a book in a thousand, one which no clergyman can afford to overlook.  
G. C. S.

*Der Ursprung des christlichen Abendmahls.* By August Arnold. Freiburg & St. Louis: Herder, pp. xvi + 196. American price \$2.90.

Roman Catholic scholars in recent years have excelled in monographs in which all important contemporary contributions to their subject are explained and analyzed. Herr Arnold's book is of this class, opening with a seven-page bibliography of the most representative writers on eucharistic origins; practically all of whom are later discussed at some length. Consequently this is an invaluable volume for rapid reference, facilitated further by a full index. It is to be hoped, however, that the author will supplement this work with one in which his own positive conclusions are developed directly, as these are not always easy to disentangle. Largely, of course, they are those inevitable to a writer with his background, but he lays special emphasis on the historical shift from the thanksgiving prayer to recitation of the Words of Institution. It is interesting to note that among the authors cited he praises very highly Bishop A. E. J. Rawlinson.

B. S. E.

*The First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians.* Ed. by W. K. Lowther Clarke. London: S. P. C. K. New York: Macmillan, 1937, pp. 114. \$1.60.

This is a volume in the series published by S. P. C. K. under the title 'Translations of Early Documents,' and is designed for students of the New Testament and Church History who desire a readable translation with a minimum of notes (23 pp.). There is a good introduction dealing with the Church of Rome in the first century, the occasion, date, etc., of the Epistle, St Peter and St Paul, the authority of the Roman Church, leading ideas of the Epistle, its use of Scripture, its bearing upon the liturgy, etc.

Dr Clarke admits that "a superficial reading of the Epistle leaves an impression of a second-hand and not very interesting document." However, "deeper study

leads the reader to very different conclusions. Clement is indispensable, both as rounding off our picture of New Testament times and as beginning our study of Church History as usually understood. He exemplifies the rich variety of the personalities and movements of the early Church (p. 42). . . . Compared with Ignatius or Barnabas he is in the main stream of Christianity, and in him the grandeur of the Roman Church is already manifest." F. C. G.

*Grundzüge der Kirchengeschichte.* By Hans von Schubert. Tenth edition, revised and enlarged by Erich Dinkler. Tübingen: Mohr, 1937, pp. viii + 339. RM. 6.60.

For a generation von Schubert's *Grundzüge* (3d edition translated as *Outlines of Church History*, in the Theological Translation Library) has been prized by discriminating students as a brilliant exposition of the trends and forces operative in the history of the Church. Dinkler's revision leaves von Schubert's work practically untouched, while adding a chapter of some forty pages dealing with recent and contemporary events. The new matter affords an excellent orientation. One can hardly fail to notice the tactfulness which a German historian must exercise in discussing the tense situation between Church and State in the Third Reich. P. V. N.

*Bishop Whipple's Southern Diary, 1843-44.* Edited with an Introduction by Lester B. Shippee. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1937, pp. xxvii + 208, ill. \$3.50.

Just twenty-one and recently married, the future Bishop of Minnesota had to leave his bride in New York state while he spent the winter of 1843-44 traveling through the South "to recuperate his frail physique." Gifted with unusual powers of observation, a likely interest in picturesque human types, and an intelligent concern for social and moral questions, young Whipple had the faculty of recording his observations in a fashion racy, vivid, anecdotal, and deliciously informal, as if his diary were merely to refresh his own memory and enable his bride to share some of his experiences afloat and ashore. As one might expect in an intimate journal of those days, there is a becoming amount of pious reflection in the pages of "the large black notebook." The Diary makes delightfully informative reading, with its sidelights on conditions in the Old South; and Shippee's edition from the hitherto unpublished manuscript is a splendid piece of bookmaking. P. V. N.

*Economic and Social History of Mediaeval Europe.* By Henri Pirenne. Tr. by I. E. Clegg. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1937, pp. xii + 243. \$2.00.

Originally part of a larger work on mediaeval history, Professor Pirenne's sketch of economic change from the fall of Rome to the middle of the fifteenth century is a fascinating if brief account of a vast and profoundly important subject. Students who are not satisfied with explanations of the evolution of European history that leave the economic factor out of account should turn to this book. The background it provides for church history, and for the intellectual and artistic evolution of these centuries, is perfectly obvious. The Crusades, e.g., were not exhibitions of religious fanaticism, pure and simple, but used religion in order to



wrest the Mediterranean from Moslem control, and thus to find outlets for trade and check the economic asphyxiation of northern and western Europe. Again, the Church's change of front on the question of usury is due to its own increasing wealth—until the Church found itself in the position of a rich money-lender and land-owner, and began to 'soft-pedal' the traditional ethic of the Gospel. But capitalism was no product or concomitant of Calvinism: it was in existence from the 12th century, and was, at first, represented by the very 'dregs of society'—cold, calculating profit-grabbers who took to the life of trade 'with no assets but their energy and intelligence, their love of adventure and . . . their lack of scruples.' Whether it has been any better represented at later periods, it lies outside the scope of Pirenne's book to discuss. At least it becomes steadily clearer that the life and death struggle in which Christianity has been engaged in modern times finds its hottest sector, not in doctrine and dogma, but in ethics, though the two are, of course, inseparable. Professor Pirenne helps us to see all this more clearly, not because he was discussing Christianity and Capitalism—he was not doing so—but because he gives us so vivid and realistic an account of the evolution of the past, by which our modern world came to be what it is. For this, much thanks!

F. C. G.

#### Pastoral Theology

*The Fine Art of Preaching.* By Andrew Watterson Blackwood. Macmillan, 1937, pp. ix + 168. \$1.75.

This is a good book on an old subject by the Professor of Homiletics of Princeton Theological Seminary. All the old divisions of treatment are here, expository preaching, topical preaching, doctrinal preaching: the introduction, the argument, the illustration, the conclusion. Nothing new is presented, either of content or method, but the chapters are sensible, clear, and helpful, and here and there appear pungent paragraphs which drive the message home.

For example, speaking of the necessity of wide reading of other men's sermons the author reminds us of O. W. Holmes's remark that "a man may milk three hundred cows, but he should make his own butter."

And again, introducing the chapter on "The Style of the Written Sermon," Dr. Blackwood relates how to Henry Van Dyke the story of *The Other Wise Man* came of a sudden on a sleepless night. "But," says Van Dyke, "if the story itself came without effort, the writing of the story was a serious piece of labor. I cared for it so much and felt so grateful that I should have been ashamed to put it off with cheap and easy work. I wanted to find the exact words if I could for every sentence. A clumsy phrase, a cloudy adjective, seemed intolerable—there are pages in the book that have been re-written ten times. For the brief description of the ride to Babylon I read nine books of travel, ancient and modern, in German, Greek and Latin."

One of the startling admonitions in these lectures is that if any young pastor wants to learn how to preach and how to pray, "let him commit to memory large portions of Deuteronomy!" This book, the author points out, seems to have been—with the Psalms—our Saviour's favorite book. Certain of the eleven chapters are introduced by appropriate messages culled from the writings of Dean



Sperry, Frank Mather, Jr, Bernard of Clairvaux, George Pierce Baker, Cardinal Newman, Woodrow Wilson, and Henry Van Dyke.

The book is serious, sensible, readable, and brief—an excellent book to put into the hands of the newly-ordained clergyman. G. C. S.

*The Beloved Community.* By Roger Lloyd. Macmillan, 1937, pp. 183. \$2.00.

This book is a philosophical statement of the case against the totalitarian state. After pointing out that from the beginning of history there has been a tension between the individual and the community, the author goes on to prove that the dominance of either factor is always disastrous. The true solution of the difficulty lies in the Christian idea of the Church, where the individual has his rights indeed, but where he also must check these rights by his obligations to 'The Beloved Community.' The argument is well but not laboriously sustained and the author has an attractive style. F. A. M.

*Ethical Dilemmas of Ministers.* By Frederick F. Mueller and Hugh Hartshorne. Scribner, 1937, pp. xii + 250. \$2.00.

Ten theological seminaries submitted a questionnaire to about 1400 of their alumni, receiving about 850 replies. This questionnaire dealt with problems of attitude and conduct arising out of the ministerial life. On the basis of these replies, the authors have sought to suggest a possible basis for what they term a professional code for ministers. The problems run all the way in weightiness from accepting reduced fares on the railroads to freedom in preaching and the solemnization of matrimony. In addition it is suggested that the theological seminary should either set up a course in ministerial ethics or see that the instruction in practical theology includes that subject.

The question that immediately arises is whether it is wise to set up such a code and try to make it generally applicable to all religious bodies. The reviewer doubts it. Codes do not create morality and never have. Moreover these questions are the same fundamental questions which arise for every Christian just sharpened at the point where the specialized work of the minister meets life.

However, such a treatment as this book provides has a definite value. It makes every minister think through these and similar problems more carefully and it should make instructors in practical theology more careful about seeing that their students understand the fundamental perplexities which are bound to face them in their ministerial life. F. A. M.

*Meditations in Season: on the Elements of Christian Principles.* By Herbert Wallace Schneider. Oxford University Press, 1938, pp. 83. \$1.50.

Save for the last meditation, called 'Now abideth faith, hope, and charity,' which is evidently much the same article as Prof. Schneider published in the *Journal of Philosophy* in 1924 (and which raised effective counter-query from Prof. Paul A. Schilpp in the same journal soon after), this slight volume of critical and devotional essays on the principal liturgical seasons is one of moving beauty, both as to philosophic and religious conception as well as literary style. In spirit and purpose the volume is closely allied to the *Book of Common Prayer*. It is dedicated to Chaplain Knox of Columbia by the present acting editor of the *Journal of Philosophy*. F. H. O. B.

*Three Theories of Society.* By Paul Hanly Furfey. Macmillan, 1937, pp. xii + 251. \$2.00.

The author of this book is a professor in the Catholic University of America. His three theories of society are the positivistic, in which the goal of the individual is success in terms of material things; the noetic, in which the good of the individual and the social group is insight into "deep knowledge"; and the pistic society, based on a faith which is the acceptance of revealed truth as interpreted by the Church. The analysis of the "success ideal" in the early chapters is suggestive if a little academic. The chapter on the Thomistic Doctrine of Noesis is illuminating. The closing chapters on the "Pistic Society" raise the whole question of the relation between faith and the authority of the Church. The picture that Fr Furfey paints of the Pistic Society is alluring, but without more theoretical place for the individual to criticise the social program of the church, it would seem to leave room for the development of a dangerous theocracy. C. L. S.

*Make Life Worth Living.* By Joseph R. Sizoo. Macmillan, 1937, pp. 190. \$1.75.

This book has to do with the power of religion to help individuals in dealing with the problems they have to face day by day. The philosophy of the book, such as it is, is a kind of Stoicism with Christian trimmings. The implication in the title of the book that the individual can make life worth living if he tries hard enough seems to represent quite accurately the author's fundamental belief. There is no suggestion that God in his goodness may have a hand in the matter. As sermons, with Dr Sizoo's forceful personality behind them, the several chapters in this book may have been effective. In print, they lose much of their effectiveness. C. L. S.

*The Task of Religion.* By John C. Schroeder. Harper, 1936, pp. 105. \$1.00.

This is another in that helpful and timely series of monthly publications of sermons by Harpers. The interest of the author is primarily to be practical and to make religion practical for use in every day living. The title of the book itself suggests that and when we move further on into the contents we find such themes as "What Does Christianity Do for Us?", "The Christian Attempt," "The Capacity to Respond," and "The Basic Human Demand." This is combined with a pleasant quality of imagination which must make Schroeder an appealing preacher. He speaks of the "Cinderella theme in religion," which is very suggestive. The sermons are filled with new and well chosen illustrations showing a wide range of reading on the part of the author. J. H.

*The Modern Pilgrimage.* Ed. by J. R. Lumb. Int. by A. E. J. Rawlinson. London: S.P.C.K., New York: Macmillan, 1937, pp. xiii + 270. \$1.60.

This is a sequel to *Aims and Ideals of Christian Living*. Like it, these Bible Class lessons have been produced 'in the conviction that there are today thousands of young people who are prepared to think about their religion and will be satisfied with nothing that is not intellectually comparable with what they find in serious politics or economics'. The lessons cover the following: The Faith of the Psalms; the Life of our Lord; the Teaching of the Prayer Book; the Christian's Social

Relationships; Christian Living in the World Today; Four Marks of the Christian Life; and a series of biographical studies under the title 'The Torchbearers' (St Patrick, John Eliot, Coleridge Patteson, Mary Bird, Tseng Pao-Swen, and Bishop Azariah). The book-references are modern; and the point of view, shared more or less in common by the authors of the several sections, is likewise up to date. American teachers and leaders of groups of young people will find considerable suggestion in this volume.

F. C. G.

*The Gardener who Saw God.* By Edward James. Scribner, 1937, pp. 378. \$2.50.

This is a first novel by the husband of Tillie Losch, the celebrated dancer. Moved apparently by the Book of Revelation and by the Benedicite the author has tried to produce an Apocalypse in the modern manner while describing the imaginary experiences of the head gardener of an old English estate. This young man is possessed of a sensitive and inquiring mind and dearly loves working with flowers and gardens. Thus, though supposedly uneducated and unsophisticated, and despite life's pettinesses and disillusioning disappointments, he wins through to a vision of the glory of God and of His essential nature. Mr James is often carried away by the voluminous vocabulary at his command. The style of the book is uneven, the plot confused. However, as he says through the mouth of his hero, "These things had, no doubt, often been more clearly understood, more profoundly expounded and better expressed than he could tell them to himself. . . . Nevertheless it was good to be discovering them for himself, as all men should at some time or another for themselves discover such things in order to realize them really."

C. E. H. F.

*The War Against God.* By Sidney Dark and R. S. Essex. Abingdon Press, 1938, pp. 301. \$2.00.

This is a documented history of opposition to the idea of God from the time of the Book of Job down to the present. The historical divisions are three: from Job to Machiavelli, from Luther to Comte, and the period following which is captioned 'Polite and Popular Unbelief.' Then follows a series of chapters on Russia, Germany, Turkey, Mexico, Spain and England. There are good bibliographies and the book gives one a clear survey of the anti-theistic movement in its various phases. It is a book every Christian and theist should take seriously.

F. C. G.

*The Reconciling Christ.* The Presiding Bishop's Book for Lent. Harper, 1938, pp. vi + 163. \$1.00.

It is clear that this annual Lenten book was prepared and edited by former Presiding Bishop James DeWolf Perry. In October, however, a new Presiding Bishop was elected, and so the volume is now "issued by Henry St George Tucker, D.D., Bishop of Virginia and Presiding Bishop," who contributes the meditations for Ash Wednesday and the day following.

The Six Weeks are devoted to Reconciliation between God and Man, between Man and Man, within the Fellowship, through the Sacraments, and through the Cross.

The six contributors (three bishops, three priests) are The Rev. Zebarney Phillips, The Rev. Thos. St Clair Will, Bishop Frank Wilson of Eau Claire,

Bishop Bertrand Stevens of Los Angeles, the Rev. John Crocker of Princeton, and Bishop Henry Judah Mikell of Atlanta.

The meditations are brief and pointed and helpful. The final one (for Good Friday) has separate meditations upon the seven words from the Cross.

I wonder why there is none for Easter Even. All the other weeks include a meditation for Saturday. In next year's volume, I hope this omission may be corrected.

G. C. S.

*William Shenstone.* By A. R. Humphreys. Cambridge University Press; New York: Macmillan, 1937, pp. 136. \$2.25.

Boswell mentioned William Shenstone; Alcock painted his portrait; he published some poems—in short, he was a typical gentleman of the middle eighteenth century. Mr Humphreys shows us sides of his nature which were not so typical; for Shenstone became one of the leading exponents of a new type of gardening, opposed to the formal classic lines of Louis XIV, and recommended by the Chinese, those quasi-dictators of the taste of his time. This book, moreover, gives us a clear and pleasing picture of refined country life during a period which "lived with its feet on the ground, wherever its head happened temporarily to be." Its church was "like the hermit in *Rasselas*, 'cheerful without levity, and pious without enthusiasm'"—which means without fanaticism, a vice abhorred by the Roman-English gentlemen of the day.

R. M. G.

*The Oxford Companion to Classical Literature.* Ed. by Paul Harvey. Oxford University Press, 1937, pp. xii + 484. \$3.00.

Like the author's *Oxford Companion to English Literature*, which has turned out to be one of the most useful volumes in the library of the student of English, so also this handy volume has already in a few short weeks proved itself extremely useful as a work of reference. The longer articles, e.g. Epic, Money and Coins, Priests, Religion, Texts and Studies, are really superb examples of compressed information. They are really great articles in outline and give the beginner—and the reader in a hurry—just the information needed at the moment without his having to dig for it. Sir Paul Harvey has a genius for editing an encyclopedic work of this nature. Since it is about time for a small size Bible dictionary written from a strictly up-to-date and modern point of view, we should like to suggest that Sir Paul Harvey be chosen to try his hand at it.

Such articles as Neo-Platonism, Origen, Clement of Alexandria, are naturally extremely brief; but they are accurate.

F. C. G.